

The
Church of England Pulpit,



AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

**THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY**

283.05
CHUO
v. 18

THE
Church of England Pulpit,

AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1884.

VOL. XVIII.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XVIII.

SERMONS ON :—

PAGE

Christian Heroism—By Rev. E. Thring, M.A. ...	1
Christian Burial—By Rev. F. Lawrence, B.A. ...	3
The Fall—By Dean Reichel, D.D. ...	13
The Sower—By Rev. Henry Footman ...	25
The Use of the Senses in Religion—By Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	37
<i>In Memoriam</i> .—Dedication of a Pulpit—By Rev. Herbert S. Swithinbank, M.A. ...	49
A Religion that Costs Nothing—By Rev. Arthur H. Powell, M.A. ...	51
The Dogmas of Christianity—By Rev. Dr. Tait ...	61
The Spirit of Sonship—By Rev. T. Campbell, D.D. ...	64
Oakham School Tercentenary—By the Bishop of Hereford ...	73
Prejudice—By Rev. H. Harris Davies, M.A. ...	75
History of Christian Missions—By Rev. A. S. Farrar, D.D. ...	85
The Rolling Years—By Rev. L. H. Bradford, M.A. ...	97
Pray the Prayers—By Rev. T. Henry Jones, M.A. ...	109
Who is on the Lord's Side?—By Rev. C. T. Buchanan ...	121
St. Paul's New Doctrine—By Dean Reichel, D.D. ...	133
A Religion which Develops the Fit and the Useful—By Rev. Arthur H. Powell, M.A. ...	145
Jacob's Ladder—By Rev. Courtenay Moore, M.A. ...	148
The Ark's Progress to Mount Zion—By Bishop Wordsworth, D.D. ...	157
Tenderness and Compassion—By Rev. F. B. Guy ...	169
Unselfishness—By Canon Scott-Holland, M.A. ...	181
St. Paul's Gospel—By Rev. Henry Thompson, B.A. ...	185
Labour and Flattery—By Canon Rawstorne, M.A. ...	193
The Greatness of Solomon and Solomon's God—By Rev. Frederick C. Williamson, B.A. ...	196
The Religious Aspects of Night—By Canon Liddon ...	205
Christ the Way to the Father—By Rev. Dr. Tait ...	209
Forgiveness—By Rev. John P. Wright, M.A. ...	217
Is Self-preservation the Law of Nature?—By Rev. Frederick C. Williamson, B.A. ...	229
Nature's Penalties for Disobedience—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. ...	230
Elijah and Elisha—By Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	241
The Christian Opportunity—By Rev. J. E. C. Welldon ...	253
Spiritual Worship—By Rev. T. Campbell, D.D. ...	256
On Cathedral Service—By Dean Oakley, D.D. ...	265
On the Personality of the Evil One—By Ven. J. P. Norris, D.D. ...	277
<i>In Memoriam</i> —14th December, 1861—By Rev. Thomas Miller Dickson, M.A. ...	279
Christianity—Principles, not Rules—Rev. J. P. Sandlan's, M.A. ...	289
Thirst Satisfied—Rev. J. W. Knox-Little, M.A. ...	301

SERMONS BY :—

PAGE

Bishop of Hereford—Oakham School Tercentenary	73
Bishop Wordsworth, D.D.—The Ark's Progress to Mount Zion ...	157
Dean Oakley, D.D.—On Cathedral Service ...	265
Dean Reichel, D.D.—The Fall ...	13
Dean Reichel, D.D.—St. Paul's New Doctrine ...	133
Bladon, Rev. George, B.A.—Nature's Penalties for Disobedience ...	230
Bradford, Rev. L. H., M.A.—The Rolling Years ...	97
Buchanan, Rev. C. T.—Who is on the Lord's Side? ...	121
Campbell, Rev. T., D.D.—Spiritual Worship ...	256
Campbell, Rev. T., D.D.—The Spirit of Sonship ...	64
Davies, Rev. H. Harris, M.A.—Prejudice ...	75
Dickson, Rev. Thomas Miller, M.A.— <i>In Memoriam</i> —14th December, 1861 ...	279
Farrar, Rev. A. S., D.D.—History of Christian Missions ...	85
Footman, Rev. Henry, M.A.—The Sower ...	25
Guy, Rev. F. B.—Tenderness and Compassion ...	169
Holland, Canon Scott, M.A.—Unselfishness ...	181
Jones, Rev. T. Henry, M.A.—Pray the Prayers ...	109
Knox-Little, Rev. J. W., M.A.—Thirst Satisfied ...	301
Lawrence, Rev. F., B.A.—Christian Burial ...	3
Liddon, Canon, D.D.—The Use of the Senses in Religion ...	37
Liddon, Canon, D.D.—The Religious Aspects of Night ...	205
Liddon, Canon, D.D.—Elisha and Elijah ...	241
Moore, Rev. Courtenay, M.A.—Jacob's Ladder ...	148
Norris, Ven. J. P., D.D.—On the Personality of the Evil One ...	277
Powell, Rev. Arthur H., M.A.—A Religion which Develops the Fit and the Useful ...	145
Powell, Rev. Arthur H., M.A.—A Religion that Costs Nothing ...	51
Rawstorne, Canon, M.A.—Labour and Flattery ...	193
Sandlands, Rev. J. P., M.A.—Christianity—Principles, not Rules ...	289
Swithinbank, Rev. Herbert S., M.A.— <i>In Memoriam</i> .—Dedication of a Pulpit ...	49
Tait, Rev. Dr.—Christ the Way to the Father ...	209
Tait, Rev. Dr.—The Dogmas of Christianity ...	61
Thompson, Rev. Henry, B.A.—St. Paul's Gospel ...	185
Thring, Rev. E., M.A.—Christian Heroism ...	1
Welldon, Rev. J. E. C., M.A.—The Christian Opportunity ...	253
Williamson, Rev. Frederick C., B.A.—The Greatness of Solomon and Solomon's God ...	196
Williamson, Rev. Frederick C., B.A.—Is Self-preservation the Law of Nature? ...	229
Wright, Rev. John P., M.A.—Forgiveness ...	217

LEADING ARTICLES:—

PAGE

Cremation	6
The Diaconate	17
The Bishops and the Revolution	30
The Grand Old Man	42
The King and his Satellite	54
Oakham School	55
The Real Presence	66, 91
Diocesan Synods	66
Socialism	78
Infidelity	100
Reform of Convocation	113
The London Mission	124
The Church and Overcrowding	138
The Attack on the House of Lords	150
Popular Literature	162
Church Boards	174
Lay Ministrations	187
The Church and the Dwellings of the Poor... ..	188
Social Purity	198
Church Defence	212
The Overcrowded Dwellings of the Poor	223
Bishop Fraser's Charge	233
The Bishop of London's Charge	246, 258
Diocesan Conferences	268
The Irish Canons	282
Results of Recent Historical and Topographical Research upon the Old and New Testament Scriptures	293
Social Chasms	307

PAPERS:—

The Authority of Scripture (Rev. Theophilus Campbell, D.D.)	18
The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles (Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A.)	31
Notes of a Flying Visit to the Rock of Cashel (Rev. Courtenay Moore, M.A.)	55
Our Lord's Last Words on the Cross	67
The Loss of Eden	79, 189
Lost Writings Referred to or Quoted in Holy Scrip- ture (Rev. J. Maskell)	101
Saul and Samuel: Pope and Emperor (Edmund Lawrence)	114, 125
Shall we Change the Prayer Book?	139
The Bishop of Carlisle's Address to the Church Congress	163
The Carlisle Church Congress (Rev. Courtenay Moore, M.A.)	175
Elijah's Error	178
The Duty of the Church with regard to the Over- crowded Dwellings of the Poor (Rev. J. M. Wilson, M.A.)	190
The Best Means of Raising the Standard of Public Morality (Rev. E. Thring, M.A.)	199
Popular Literature with Reference to Infidelity and Public Morality (Rev. J. E. C. Wellnd, M.A.)	219
On Heresy (Edmund Lawrence)	234
Social Purity (Bishop of Peterborough)	247
Theology and Science (Rev. C. P. Reichel, D.D.)	269
Results of Recent Historical and Topographical Research upon the Old and New Testament Scriptures (Bishop of Durham)	290

CORRESPONDENCE:—

Miasmal Cemeteries	6
Working Men and the Church of England	7
Church Patronage	7
When were our Gospels Written? 8, 22, 44, 57, 92, 118, 142, 151, 179, 202, 224, 238, 249, 284, 297	
Marriages of Affinity	21, 35, 43
The Burial of the Dead	23, 36, 44
The Diaconate	35, 59, 69
Church Patronage.—Popular Election	46
The Bishops and the Revolution	47
Evidence of Senses for the Real Presence 59, 80, 106	

CORRESPONDENCE:—

PAGE

Sermons... ..	60
Dr. Poore on Burial	68
Our Lord's Vernacular Language	69
Transubstantiation.—Evidence of the Senses 69, 227	
A Foreigner upon our Mortuary Customs	95
Socialism	105, 119
Canon Liddon on the Real Presence	106
The Communion and Marriage Law... ..	117
Socialism and Irish Land Acts	128
Reform of Convocation	129, 141
The Tyranny of Custom	129
The London Mission	141
Church and State	153
Harvest Thanksgivings	153
Church Congresses	153
Private and Family Prayers	154
Benignant Nature	166
Shall we Change the Prayer Book?	167
Reform of the House of Lords	178
Accuracy	191
Agnostic Taunts	203
Virtualism—What is It?	213
The Bishop of London and the Rev. Mercer Davies 214	
God's Ordinance and Man's Devices	226
Layman's Work in London	227
The Galilee Chapel and Bede's Tomb	227, 236
Overcrowded Dwellings of the Poor 237, 259, 272, 285	
Self-Preservation	252
Irish Respect for the Dead and the Priesthood	260
Inspiration	260
Cleanliness next to Godliness... ..	273
"Mild Expletives"	285
Refusing the Holy Communion	294
The Kilkenny Cats	299
How to Deal with "Rookeries"	308
Is Eucharistic Worship Idolatrous?	309
Water Baptism—Is it Obligatory on Infants or even Adults?	310
The Slow Progress of Sanitation	310

REVIEWS AND NOTICES:—

"Was Paul Crucified for You?" "The Unknown Sufferings of Christ" (the late Dr. Jeune)	12
"The Salvation of Mankind by only Christ our Saviour from Sin and Death Everlasting" (No. III. of Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches)... ..	36
<i>The Christian Socialist</i>	47
"Marriage with a Wife's Sister directly Prohibited by God's Word" (Rev. J. S. Stoke-Vaughan, M.A.)	60
"Who was this John Wesley? A Question for the Wesleyans" (Rev. T. A. Carr, LL.D.)... ..	70
"Life: Is it Worth Living?" (Rev. J. M. Lang)	70
"A Trip to America" (William Hardman)	81
"The Gospel and the Age" (Bishop of Peter- borough)	130
"Richard Waldo Sibthorp. A Biography told chiefly in his own Correspondence" (Rev. J. Fowler)	143
"The Theological Library. How is the Divinity of Jesus Depicted in the Gospels and Epistles?" (Rev. T. Whitelaw, D.D.)	154
<i>The Expositor</i>	179, 239, 299
"The Prophets of Christendom: Sketches of Eminent Preachers" (Bishop of Ripon)	192
"The Key of Doctrine and Practice, 1884" (Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A.)	214
"The Medical Language of St. Luke" (Rev. Wil- liam Kirk Hobart, LL.D.)	238
"The Twenty Thousand Clergy and the Present Crisis" (Rev. R. H. Hessey)	261
"The Message to the Seven Churches of Asia Minor" (Rev. Andrew Tait, LL.D.)	262
"The Unique Grandeur of the Bible" (Rev. W. Anderson, M.A.)	262

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

PAGE

"The Relation between Religion and Science" (Bishop of Exeter)	275
"Notes on the Review of Dr. Hobart's 'Medical Language of St. Luke'"	286
"First Principles of the Reformation; or the Ninety-five Theses and the Three Primary Works of Dr. Martin Luther" (Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., and C. A. Buchheim, Ph.D.) ...	287
"The Salt of Life" (Rev. N. A. Garland, M.A.) ..	287
"Poverty" (James Platt, F.S.S.)	287
"Unity and Catholicity" (Bishop Plunket) ...	300
"Balaam: An Exposition and a Study" (Samuel Cox, D.D.)	311
<i>The Monthly Interpreter</i> (Rev. J. S. Exell, M.A.)	311

POETRY :—

Whither? (Arthur H. Powell, M.A.)	70
The Dream of Pilate's Wife (Joseph John Murphy)	107
Growing Old	156

MISCELLANEOUS :—

North Wales College	23
Legality of Cremation	23
Subjects for the Carlisle Church Congress ...	23
Italy and Arbitration	23
Funeral Reform	48
St. Michael and All Angels, Walthamstow...	60
Wakefield Bishopric	70
Conference of American Bishops	70
Oakham School Tercentenary	71
Ven. Archdeacon Crawley's Jubilee... ..	71
Death of Rev. G. W. Pieritz	71
Church Patronage—Report of Select Committee	72
Holy Trinity Church, Bengoe	82
Presentation Address to Bishop of Ripon ...	82
Minster Library, York	83
Woolfield's Bequest to the National Society	83
Inherited Sentiment	83
Bishop Piers Claughton	83
Late Rector of Lincoln College	84
Bishop Stubbs on Education	95
Golden Wedding of Rev. W. Dixon, D.D....	108
New Chancel in Parish Church of Marylebone	108
Norwich Diocesan Training College... ..	119
Bishop of Lichfield's Theological Prizes ...	119
Spire of Patrington Church	120
Oxford Diocesan Conference	120
Volunteering—By Rev. Dr. Macleod	120

MISCELLANEOUS :—

PAGE

Bishop Bickersteth's Memorial Fund	131
Restoration of Sherborne Abbey Tower	132
The Lambeth Pedlar's Window	132
Rev. Henry Hunter Hughes	132
Archbishop of York's Address to Working Classes	156
Church of England Funeral Reform Association ...	156
Carlisle Congress	161, 215
New Church, Buxton	168
Guild of St. Matthew	168
Westminster Abbey Repair Fund	179
Confirmation at Walsall	180
National Society at Kidderminster	192
Bishop of Peterborough on Housing the Poor ...	187
St. Saviour's Priory, Hackney Road	204
Clerical Society of Cambridge	215
Father Ignatius's Mission	216
Tour of the Archbishop of Canterbury	228
Central African Mission at Cambridge	228
Restoration of Abbots Kerswell Church	240
Consecration of All Saints' Church, Rangemore ...	240
Universities Settlement Association	252
Shoemakers' Church, Northampton... ..	262
Church Association and the Bishops	263
Cathedral for Diocese of Liverpool	263
Mission Room, West Wellow	263
Peterborough Cathedral Restoration	263
Clare College Mission... ..	263
St. John's College, Cambridge, Mission	263
Restoration at Cliffe-at-Hoo	264
Salvation Army, Cambridge	275
The Cavendish Professorship... ..	276
Church Parochial Mission Society	288
Bishop of Ripon's Visit to Bradford... ..	288
Fawcett Memorial Meeting, Cambridge	288
Opium in British Burmah	288
Bishop of Lincoln's Health	300
A Conjoint Bishops' Examination	300
A New Game of Cricket	306
The Peterhouse Sexcentenary	312
PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36,	
48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144,	
156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240,	
252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312	
CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72,	
84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168,	
180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264,	
276, 288, 300, 312	

The Church of England Pulpit

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XVIII.—No. 445.

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1884.

PRICE TWOPENCE.



The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRISTIAN HEROISM.

BY THE REV. E. THRING, M.A., HEAD MASTER
OF UPPINGHAM SCHOOL.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE.

"Thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast."—MATTH. vi. 17, 18.

THIS is a command. And it is of the very nature of a command to be short and simple. Nothing comes more direct from the inner life than a command. Life touches life at once; straight comes the power out, straight it goes to its mark. A command is life power more condensed, more unmixed, more driven home, than anything else. "March," says the commander, and a hundred thousand men move to the field of death. "Charge," he cries, and with one mighty rush the torrent of life bursts forth to conquer or to die. For all understand, all feel, the grand resistless simplicity of a true authority in its commands. God in His highest work commands. God said, "Let there be light," and there was light; and Christ commands—the Gospels are commands, or simple statements akin to command, or example, which is command in a living energy. And Christ's commands come to us as the most direct communication of God to man, the simplest touch of divine life, the most disencumbered of all earthly mediums. The Master speaks—who will obey? The Master calls—who will follow? And no call to follow Him has ever reached man in a purer form than this command, this call, to do all hard things easily for His sake. No nobler words than these, which tell us when we fast to be as those who feast, ever decided the great question of

what to do and how to do it. The Master calls; it is for us to come. The Master commands; it is for us to obey.

It is unnecessary, I suppose, to show that in the kingdom of life fasting means all self-denial. Words are as dead as the ink that prints them, unless the true life-meaning is taken. The letter killeth. Fasting is an expression for that self-mastery, which begins by self-mastery in food; for no one who is the slave of his body is free to act; but freedom is the end in view. Life moving, life powerful, life able to do or bear at any true command, is fasting as interpreted by life; and a weary man coming back from breathing the air of close rooms, or tried by sedentary work, who forces himself to eat in spite of no appetite and repugnance, obedient to the command, "Thou shalt not kill,"—thyself any more than another,—as truly fasts by eating, as the robust open-air worker does by abstaining from food. The self-denial in this can be greater, the life-meaning of self-mastery more perfect, as real life interprets the command, and turns the dead letter into a living reality. Be not deceived; each man knows truth only so far as he has lived it. The letter is dead, never more dead than when grasped by the keen intellect without the feeling, without the interpreting life. This then is the command of Christ. His men must not let their trials be seen. They must do all hard things with a genial pleasant face like men at a feast, easily and lovingly. And they must not be acting a part in this; it must be real. That is, this is the ideal of manhood towards which all effort must tend; in the spirit of which all beginnings must be made. The character aimed at must be a cheerful festival spirit, and the outcome of that character must be a joyous face and look, not different in any respect from the worldly man in his look of enjoyment. We must set before ourselves as a pattern a genial mastery of hardship, a real delight in the deeds of the brave and the strong, a real joy of the conqueror in the happy face, a real power of life in the easy performance. Life and its spirit must be matched against the pain in this, as it is in lower things. What man who runs a race does not exult in the active powers, though the strain may be severe,

and the power gained by much of pain? What man who rows does not exult in the mighty swing of the trained arms, and the speed; though the skill and the strength involve pain? It *is* true, then, that a lesser pain may underlie a great joy, and indeed produce it. It *is* true, then, that Christ's command to look joyous whilst doing painful or difficult things is in accordance with man's nature, and there is no unreality in bidding us "climb the steep ascent of heaven" with the natural buoyant spring of heavenly life, with the elastic step of the born mountaineer, and not the heavy plodding drag of the day-labourer. And if so, then it follows that our look and behaviour, and dress and bearing, as we are doing nothing uncommon, shall not be uncommon either. This is Christ's command. His men are to look to the world just like men of the world in their festival hours; no one is to know by their look what they are doing in their trials. The trials are part of the true life, a matter-of-course part of it, and, as such, are not matters out of the way, or specialties to be marked. This is exactly the command that was given in a very inferior degree by the great duke in the Peninsular war, when he issued as the order of the day, "that there should be no more volunteering for forlorn hopes or storming parties; it was the soldiers' duty, and the regiments should take it in turn as such;" there are to be no "forlorn hopes" in the kingdom and army of Christ. This appears to be the first plain meaning of the command, no ticketing of ourselves as doing something extraordinary; it is the soldier's duty, and the best soldier is he who makes least fuss, and does his work most easily. Nay, but Christ commands more. He commands the men of His army to have the joyous face of men at ease, to do their work, their forlorn hope work, so easily, so lovingly, that none shall know they are doing it. This is indeed a hero's ideal, a great demand, but it is the command of Christ to all His men—His command that the life shall be joyfully matched against the pain, and nothing uncommon be thought about it, no ticket saying "Look at me" be set upon the doing, no work against grain to win praise be done. No praise, no dreams of triumph,—what we *are*, not what is thought of us, must be the heart-motive. Work to win praise is indeed hypocrisy, an acting an unreal part for the gain of it, and what did the Pharisee do more? He was unreal for the gain of it, that was all; but if there is any truth, if there is any life, then growth in truth, and growth in life is all in all, not the work done, nor the praise won, whatever men think. The true measure of greatness is not the shadow cast along the earth for men to see, the image lengthened out by the low glare of lamps held up by man, that glory that lies flat on earth, and cannot leave the ground on which it rests, and without touch of which it has no being; no—true life has a being of its own, most true when

Heaven's full light shines straight down on it; it works not to cast its shadow, it cares not for what is thought of it, for the growing in Heaven's light is its joy in itself. He who fasts in Christ's Kingdom simply tastes the joy of life; he fasts because Christ's life is higher, and better and sweeter than aught else, worth all the pain, even *in* the pain worth it. There is no acting a part in his happy face, though the task may be hard, and the pain great; neither praise drags him, nor fear to do what he would not otherwise do, to act a part, to be other than his true self. Look to your motives. Christ commands that the works of life, however hard, shall be done in a holiday spirit, easily, lovingly for their own sake, with the look of a guest enjoying himself at a pleasant dinner party. The thing is simple enough; there is to be a quiet natural inward life, a joy in living, without reference to any outward gain or outward competition. Truth rejoices in itself, and does not want to be told that other men see it. Truth rejoices in itself, and moves amongst the temptations of the world glad to leave them, glad to feel above them, and does not long for what it dare not touch, but would touch, if it dared, like a felon afraid of the prison. This is the ideal set before us, the character to aim at, an ideal of life within, of a complete, perfect internal power, which whether it acts or suffers, moves or is still, meets every outward force with a natural spiritual strength to which by degrees everything becomes easy. In a word it is life as contrasted with all outward manifestations or results. It is curious in this world of sense to see how the idolatry of strength in some shape or another takes possession of most minds, and men are called great (the very word reflects the idolatry) because of actions done, or works of mind produced, that take large shapes amongst mankind, whilst the secret unknown silent endurance, the unconquerable inner life that can be patient when doing nothing, that bears whatever comes, be it shame or be it praise, that needs no strength, but can anoint the head and wash the face, and smile and look happy, whilst the strong oppress it, is not thought of. A kind of animated machine, a human embodiment of wide-reaching thought, or sword-like power is glorious, and inventive skill a god; mankind worship the Titans still, but the faintest breath of inward life divine both can and has matched itself with a calm superiority to bear, and by bearing to set at nought all the giant troubles or giant divinities of the idol-loving world. Christ's heroes hear Christ's command, and mean to live a life within in very truth, and easily, lovingly, as at a feast, to take the hardships of life as a joyous training. What matters the strength of others if they in their weakness can be trained to bear cheerfully all that the strong can do? Mark, too, this command can be obeyed by all; and surely, if it were otherwise, there is no want of courage in England's young men. Yet it is not courage that

is asked for ; a dog can be courageous ; more than courage is commanded, but a thing that all can be. All can be trained to the quiet resolution which bears what the hour brings, unconquered ; all can aim at the splendid patience that waits or works with equal energy of inward power, content to meet the message of each day with perfect obedience ; all can strive for the peaceful hardihood which penetrates a thousand nameless nooks of untold misery with stores of secret blessing, like some clear rivulet, seeking no reward ; all can catch something of the prophet heart which being in its own truthful circle can see truth in the world outside, and Christ the King being crucified there, and seeing this does not, as fools do, seek for justice, or expect its rights, knowing well that in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is hung as a traitor for daring to see. All can win at length that omnipotent silence, which in the clutch of evil power cannot be made to utter words of useless self-defence, that omnipotent silence, which persecuted, reviled, in the midst of triumphant wrong, checks the fierce fire of the burning tongue, and will not put the spark to the dry wood, but dies mute and voiceless, self-restrained even unto death, rather than overthrow wrong by kindling fiercer wrong. All can do these things, for they require nothing but a spirit of quiet endurance ; no strength is needed but this. This power of living alone within the heart-sanctuary, even as we die alone, that world-wide bit of teaching that every man can see, which sends us all into our inner chambers to live as we must die, without any companion but life itself, this can be learnt by all. And all this must be done easily, that is the command, easily, lovingly ; the only thing out of the common permitted is an unusual cheerfulness. Brethren, this is to be a hero. A hero does hard things easily, so easily that no one sees them to be hard, so easily that he himself, as life goes on, has learnt to forget the hardness, and to rejoice in the manly joy of matching life against self-indulgence or pain. Surely what a power there would be in this place if this was the ideal of life. What a power there is in this place ; only let this fountain of knowledge become also a fountain of life, only let life—life—be the *one* aim, and clumsy idolatries of strength and praise come to an end. And, as all can have Christian heroism, so it can begin always ; nothing is too small for a beginning, nothing too great for the end, since it is a true growth in life. And it is the positive command of Christ that we all strive to attain this easy self-mastery, which does hard things in a common cheerful way. I am bid challenge you to-day in Christ's name to obey this His command, and challenge you, too, in a way which ought to come home to all here more than in any other place in the world. A very noble work is being done here by the Cambridge Old Schools and the Church of England Primary Schools generally. More than four thousand

children are being educated, and it is easy to see that much help is needed for this great work to go on at all ; a thousand pounds of voluntary subscriptions were needed last year, and almost any sum might be spent with advantage in meeting the demands of increasing population and in making the work in other ways more effective. There is no doubt about the goodness of the work, and this University which lives by its endowments is also a great living endowment to hand on life from itself. Much true work, I understand, is given ; noble subscriptions and donations I see are made by some, but we want no forlorn hopes in Christ's army, we want every man to have some touch of the hero, every man to be learning that quiet self-mastery which, by degrees, does the hardest things easily, with a smile on the face. This true heroic temper, which all can have, is always finding exercise in little things. Christ commands ; to-day you are called on to obey. Those who believe the command of Christ will obey it, those who do not believe it won't. Not a word more shall be added ; when a true authority says " March," no true soldier sits still.

CHRISTIAN BURIAL.

BY THE REV. F. LAWRENCE B.A., VICAR OF WESTOW, LATE RECTOR OF ST. MARY'S, CASTLEGATE, YORK.

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE CATHEDRAL, MANCHESTER, ST. JAMES'S DAY, JULY 25TH, 1883.

" Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same ; that through death He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil ; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."—HEBREWS ii. 14, 15.

WHAT notion of death did most of us get when we were young ? That it was the end of all that was beautiful and bright and hopeful. A relative died ; the house was darkened ; one thought seemed uppermost—the preparation of black attire for all, even for the little children. On the awful day of burial, a black-plumed hearse carried away the body, and in all the visible surroundings there was not one ray of hope. True, in the words of the Prayer Book, there was hope, but all that met the eye gave the lie to that hope. The tendency of this was to render us, all our life-time, subject to bondage ; to create a shudder at the very thought of death ; to cause preparation for death to be avoided as something too terrible to think of ; to suggest that it was best to get all we could out of this world and to forget the next ; " to eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

To appreciate the extent to which the idea of the life on earth has been impoverished by an imperfect and mistaken idea of death, we must

strive to know wherein lies the true significance of this life. Compared with that part of life which is to come hereafter, this life is only as the single drop of water to the mighty deep. Life has hardly begun when that which we call death comes. Our life only begins in this world; to be developed and perfected hereafter. Life on this side the grave borrows its significance from what shall be hereafter, and can only be understood when considered in reference thereto. Imperfect and miserably impoverished is that life on earth which is not conscious of the sublime onward march which awaits it after death. Imperfect, stunted, and dwarfed is that life which wraps itself up in the present; and in so far as our funeral observances tend to produce this result, so far do they need to be reformed.

Each day well lived is an epitome of life. We rise every morning to a new life; a life wrapped up in a few hours, yet full of the richest promise. We thank God for raising us up to a new day—a new life. We ask Him to guide and keep us all the day. We go forth to do our duty in that state of life to which God has called us. We try to glorify God and His Christ, and to abide during all the hours in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. We strive to bless and help our brethren. And so the happy day runs its course, and at last we commend soul and body to the keeping of Him who neither slumbereth nor sleepeth. We ask forgiveness for Christ's sake, and we lay ourselves down, and what? We lay ourselves down, and, in a sense, we die. Verily, every night we die. "Sleep, death's twin-brother." God in His infinite love has given us many rehearsals of death. And our prayer every night is—

Teach me to live that I may dread
The grave as little as my bed.

So the lifetime of the days runs its course, and at last the physician bids us put our house in order. That we have done every night. We are quite ready; there's naught to do but wait till the Lord call. This is our song: "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." And who stands upon the farther shore to welcome us? Even Jesus Christ our Lord, Who hath overcome the sharpness of death and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers. So at length we fall into the last sleep, to wake in Paradise.

"There is no death: what seems so is transition."

"The Christian man hath three friends—himself, his God, and the Angel Death."

Death, then, being the beginning of a higher life, what should be our funeral observances? There must be real heartfelt sorrow on the part of those who are left behind—for this is natural and Scriptural; but, instead of the unmeaning pomp and dismal pagentry of processional paraphernalia, and the conventional exhibition of extravagant fashionable mourning attire, which involve un-

profitable expenditure, inflict severe hardship upon persons of limited means, and neither mitigate grief nor manifest respect for the dead, there should be the exercise and outward manifestation of the three Christian principles, Faith, Hope, and Love.

Faith prevents excessive grief. Faith in God the Father,

Whose love is as great as His power,
And neither knows limit nor end.

Faith in God the Son, Who hath made known a full and free salvation to all who truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy gospel, and Who through death hath brought to naught him that had the power of death. Faith in the Holy Spirit, whose fruits are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Oh! the boundless love of the Most High. It is He Who gave. It is He Who hath taken away. Shall we not add, "Blessed be the name of the Lord"? To yield to inordinate grief were to dishonour God. Faith in God and zeal in the work which God has given us to do on earth will make the poignancy of our grief to pass away.

Hope inspires an expression of brightness in the midst of sorrow.

If there were no Hope, it were fitting to cover everything with black, the symbol of despair, and to carve upon the gravestone the inverted torch, the symbol of extinction. But, thank God, there *is* Hope. Christ came to bring life and immortality to light. The soul of the departed one is in the loving keeping of Him Who hath the key of Paradise. The body that we lay in the grave in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord, is in the loving keeping of Him Who hath the key of the grave. So we use flowers, which we cull from our own gardens, emblems of the infinitely varied and tender love of God; emblems, too, of the Resurrection. And we sing a psalm or a hymn. And we do not place over the grave the pagan urn, nor the broken column, nor any costly monument—for is not death the great leveller—but rather some simple symbol instinct with Christian intention and expressing Christian Hope.

Love manifests itself toward the departed, the bereaved, the bearers, the neighbours, and poorer brethren.

Love for the departed loved one suggests that regard be had to his wishes with respect to the avoidance of all ostentatious and expensive arrangements; that the greatest reverence be paid to the body, and that, wherever possible, relations or immediate friends perform the last offices, and bear him to his burial, as "devout men bore Stephen to his burial;" that no attempt be made to preserve the body, and that there be no brick grave or vault, but that the body be placed in the simple earth, to return naturally to the earth, whence it came—

"Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust:" reminding us of God's primæval sentence, "Unto dust shall thou return."

Love to the bereaved suggests that there be no intrusion upon their sorrow, that friends meet at the church or cemetery rather than at the house of mourning, and take no part in feasting and treating before or after the burial.

Love or consideration for the bearers suggests that the body be not kept too long, and that the coffin be made as light as possible, and that, unless there be special reasons, there be no metallic or leaden coffin.

Love for the neighbours and poorer brethren suggests that simplicity, economy, and good taste be observed in every detail. Recognising the fact that ostentation is repugnant to the higher feelings, the rich would think of others when they bury their own dead, and would prove by their example that the exercise of economy is no evidence of want of respect, or of love; and instead of lavishing much upon coffin, funeral ceremonial, and mourning apparel, they would show their respect for the dead by some gift which would benefit the living, some gift to God's Church, some gift to His poor.

Where the tyranny of custom is so well established, as in the case of Funeral Ceremonial, it seems essential that those who see the need of reform should unite in an organization for spreading their ideas. It is easy to object to propagandas and societies, but to practical Englishmen no other way has occurred of carrying out a desired end. Hence the existence of the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, which was formed at a meeting held during the Congress week at Sheffield, in the year 1878, under the presidency of the Bishop of Sodor and Man, upon the proposition of Earl Nelson, seconded by the Rev. Canon Erskine Clarke, and supported by the Mayor of Sheffield, having for its object the promotion of a better appreciation of the idea of Christian Burial, by encouraging the adoption of such observances as give prominence to the Christian principles of Faith, Hope, and Love. The society does not lay down laws: it simply offers suggestions which, if followed, would afford relief from much anxiety, difficulty, and expense. While it discourages ostentatious and expensive arrangements generally, feasting and treating, the use of crape, plumes, scarves, as also of metal coffins, brick graves, and other things which unduly retard the return of the body to the earth, it would yet have every effort made to mark the solemnity of the occasion, and suggests the assembling at the church instead of at the house of mourning, the use in country places of a bier on wheels or some such contrivance, whereby friends and neighbours may render the last offices, the singing of hymns, and the giving of alms to the poor, or making a donation to some charitable

or religious work, as means of showing respect for the dead. The funeral of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, who was one of the Presidents of the Society, was in accordance with these suggestions. The decoration of the coffin was done by his daughters; the body was moved to the churchyard upon a bier wheeled by humble friends; all the mourners followed on foot; there was no paraphernalia or parade of mourning; there had been early Communion in the church; the church was decorated with flowers by loving hands; the psalms were chanted, and hymns sung; and the grave was lined with evergreens. There had been manifest improvement, but the changes were not wholly satisfactory. As the Archbishop of York said recently, "There might be a danger from another direction. He should be sorry if the poor came to feel that they had not done honour to their dead, because they could not load and overload the coffin with flowers, and adorn the church with the same costly though beautiful adornments. The rule throughout should be simplicity."

Thus had the Society endeavoured to promote a better appreciation of the idea of Christian burial. While, however, it put forth emphatically what it believed to be a true view of the relation of death to this life, in the case of the faithful humble follower of Christ, it was also solicitous to show forth the awfulness of death to the unrepentant sinner; and declared with no uncertain voice that to lose sight of the solemn warning, "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgment," would be an evil of the greatest magnitude, and fraught with the direst consequences. What the Society put forth for universal acceptance, was that the death to be feared was the death of sin, but that the death of the body the true Christian need not fear. A Christian funeral should therefore in its ritual throughout symbolize the Christian principles of Faith, Hope, and Love, and thus bear witness in the most effective way, to our emancipation from the fear of death by Him "Who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again, hath restored to us everlasting life."

CANON LIDDON has, we are informed, reconsidered his intention of changing his months of residence at St. Paul's with Canon Scott Holland. His next turn will therefore be in August.

THE Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway has resigned the incumbency of Trinity Church, Ayr, which he has held for fifty-two years. The patronage is in the hands of the vestry, with whom a committee of the congregation have been combined.

THE *Church Times* states that Mr. Mackonochie will take up his residence in the clergy-house of St. Alban's, Holborn, next September, and will assist in the work of the parish. The Press Association is informed that the arrangement has been made at the request of the Vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, and with the full consent of the Bishop.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1884.

CREMATION.

ON the 14th ultimo, we described the process by which our bodies were resolved into their ultimate elements by means of the earth, a process which in a gravelly, sandy, or other porous subsoil is calculated to occupy about three years, and which we contended is accomplished by nature, if unthwarted by man's meddlesome, obstructive, and ostentatious interference, without the smallest detriment to the living. Against this view, which is amply proved by modern scientific facts, experiments and observations, "Clericus," in our present issue, brings a formidable catalogue of ancient scientific observations and opinions. Our answer to these ancient testimonies is that they are not confirmed by the more accurate and searching interrogations of modern scientists. "Clericus," however, does mention one modern instance, occurring in 1843 at Minchinhampton in this country, which as yet we have not been able to investigate. Against this one case of *post hoc propter hoc* reasoning some hundreds of cases of the perfectly harmless removal of the remains of the dead could be quoted, from the time that the soil from excavations for the foundations of the present St. Paul's Cathedral were spread over the moorland of Bunhill's Fields, and Mr. Bunhill himself had the sagacity and perhaps the right from this cause to label his fields as consecrated ground, and they became the great burying ground of the Nonconformists, where more bodies were deposited than in any spot of the same size in or around London. No epidemics have ever been shown or even suggested to have taken their rise from this burying-ground; on the contrary the many thousands of invalids and children who have frequented this cemetery, which by the liberality of the City Corporation was several years since converted into a recreation ground, have greatly benefited in health and strength. The brother and sister who for very many years had charge of this burial-ground, and walked round it every morning of their lives before breakfast, each attained the age of nearly one hundred years! We have ourselves witnessed the removal of a huge number of bodies from the

churchyard of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and the old St. Pancras Burying-ground, without the occurrence of a single case of disease. Besides these and other imaginary evils that are said to arise from inhumation, we have heard it asserted that the worms bring up the contagium of disease from infected bodies. This and such-like assertions are put forward in the name of science! Surely it is unscience, not science, which is adverse to Nature's method of resolving our defunct bodies. We would advise our readers to lay to heart the admirable sermon on Funeral Reform which we print on another page. We trust that there will be a full gathering at the Conference to be held on this most important subject, as advertised elsewhere in our columns. It is this much-needed reform that will stifle the demand for cremation, which we hold to be an unnatural and unscriptural mode of disposing of the dead. The objections to cremation are numerous, and in one or two instances insuperable. To complete the obliteration and resolution of the body in ten minutes, when nature takes at least three years to accomplish the same result, appears to us *primâ facie* to be inimical to the vegetable and animal kingdom, because it is a sudden and violent interruption to the grand and orderly progression of nature. It is a process which is too expensive to be extensively applied. The most formidable and insuperable objection to it is the medico-legal difficulty, where the cremator would become the unwilling assistant and accomplice of the secret murderer. Burial in the earth has the great advantage over cremation, that if a body be buried it can be exhumed for the purpose of identification, and also of examination, in cases of suspected poisoning. We think the sacred utterance in the Book of Genesis with reference to the origin and physical end of man to be a Divine mandate requiring the *burial* of the dead.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MIASMAL CEMETERIES.

SIR,—My last letter on "The Burial of the Dead" has called forth some editorial comments which I trust you will suffer me to notice. You state that "we require better authorities and better authenticated facts to convince us of the existence of 'the blue mist' and other grave sanitary evils detailed by 'Clericus.'" The authorities in favour of the disease-creating character of soil in which the dead have been *improperly* buried are numerous, and their testimony conclusive. Grecian, Roman, and Arabian writers are unanimous on this point. Hippocrates, Galen, and Lucretius considered the miasms exuded from the soil and from putrid animal bodies as the chief causes of those pestilential epidemics which from time to time have occasioned such appalling ravages among mankind. Avenzoar distinctly states that emanations

from polluted water and decaying human bodies give rise to such scourges. Diodorus Siculus ascribed the infectious plague of Athens, and the disease which attacked the Carthaginian army in Sicily, to emanations from grave-grounds. The introduction of pestilence into Malaga, in 1803, commenced in the house of a noted smuggler. Dr. Arejula avers that this man's body, with the connivance of the curate, was buried in the Church of St. Peter, and that those who entered the sacred edifice to hear mass on St. Michael's Day were all seized with illness, and a great part of them died; owing to which calamity the building was closed, and continued so for two years. It is further alleged, on excellent authority, that the re-appearance of the plague in Modena, in 1828, originated by an excavation having been made in some ground where the victims of the plague had been interred three centuries before. Again, in 1843, when the parish church of Minchinhampton was rebuilding, the superfluous soil of the churchyard was disposed of for manure, and finally deposited on many of the neighbouring gardens. The result was that the town became almost decimated. At Riom, in Auvergne, the earth of an ancient cemetery was dug up to embellish the city. Shortly afterwards an epidemic broke out, carrying off a great number of persons, the mortality being most general contiguous to the source of contagion. A similar occurrence took place from the like cause, six years previously, in Emfert, a small town of the same province. Dr. Roger S. Tracy, the Health Officer of New York, observes in his essay on "Nuisances" that the putrefaction of a great number of bodies in one place, even though many feet under ground, has proved dangerous to the public health. He cites as an instance that when the yellow fever visited New York, in 1822, the mortality was extensive, the disease being most frequent and persistent in the vicinity of Trinity churchyard, wherein bodies were crowded, and only covered with eighteen inches of earth. Professor Selmi, of Mantua, discovered in the stratum of air which had remained for a certain period over a cemetery, during a time of calm, organisms which vitiated the atmosphere, and were pronounced destructive to life. Indeed, many people in England and other countries have noticed a thick vapour over graves in the neighbourhood of their dwellings, nauseous to the smell, and so offensive that they were obliged to have the windows of their houses closed. Dr. James Copland, in his "Medical Dictionary," asserts that emanations from dead and putrifying bodies, insufficiently covered by the soil, induce pestilential generation within or around the vicinity of cemeteries. By means of such causes of destruction to the living, the writer contends, "ancient cities have generated the sources of their own decay, which circumstances have retarded or accelerated according as these sources have been counteracted or augmented by legislative measures either of a beneficial or of an injurious tendency." From the evidence thus adduced as to the injuriousness of cemeteries, I cannot conceive how "London children can be benefited in health and strength by being allowed to frequent Bunhill Fields, St. Pancras, Marylebone, and other crowded burial-grounds." Of the virtues of the earth I am fully conscious, no less than of its absorbent, deodorant, and disinfecting properties; but then the earth can only act upon the bodies committed to it under certain conditions. First of all, it must be dry earth, and not sodden clay; while, secondly, no solid obstacle must be placed between it and the dead, in order to be

suffered to exercise its powers. On these points we seem to be at one. Hence it is that I favour the Hadenic or Woking system of sepulture, which I have several times witnessed, and always with increased approval, in the London Necropolis, Surrey. Let but the earth-to-earth method be made *compulsory*, as Mr. Seymour Haden contends that it should be, and we shall be on the way to a most important funeral reform, while the danger arising from miasma will in future become gradually less and less, until none whatever will exist. CLERICUS.

WORKING MEN AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

SIR,—At the annual meeting of the E. C. U., Mr. C. Powell is reported by the *Church Times* to have said:—"The fact that they could hardly go into any well-ordered parish but that they would find a branch of the C. E. W. M. S. in existence, was a striking answer to the statement that working-men did not care for the Church of England." Last Sunday morning (St. Peter's Day) I visited two churches at Hoxton, in the parish of one of which, I believe, there is a branch of the C. E. W. M. S. in existence, while both churches are endowed by what Mr. Powell terms "revived life in the Church of England." My visit was to see the proof of the combined work of the E. C. U. and the C. E. W. M. S., expecting to find in each church a large attendance of working-men. At St. Mary's I did not find ten men in a congregation of about forty. At St. Columbo's there were about twenty men. Now, supposing they were all working-men, what a large attendance for the two churches!

Within a few yards of each of these churches, there are two market streets—Nile Street, near St. Mary, and Hoxton Street, near St. Columbo—where I found hundreds of working men, their wives and children, buying and selling. On previous Sundays I have walked through these streets and counted 600 people marketing at 12 o'clock in the day. There are at least 1,200 shops open on Sunday in Shoreditch, of which parish Hoxton is a large "Liberty." Now supposing each shop has twenty-one customers during the day, we have 25,000 people in Shoreditch spending a portion of their time in Sunday trading. I would ask Mr. Powell where is the fruit of the usefulness of C. E. W. M. S. in Hoxton? Did we not have less Sunday trading, before these days of so-called "revived life of the Church of England." Were not our churches better filled with working-men before the services were turned into semi-theatrical performances, and before our prayers were droned out for us by the organ?

ALFRED COLE.

Hoxton, July 1st, 1884.

CHURCH PATRONAGE.

SIR,—The introduction of the Church Patronage Bill, and the discussion on the amendment, have raised large issues. Most of those issues are not involved in the provisions of the Bill as brought forward, which would probably be found unworkable. The real issue of moment is, where should the power of appointment to benefices reside?

Any attempt to forbid by law the sale of advow-

sons, while leaving the right of presentation as it is, will be unsuccessful. A right of the kind is a privilege which has a money value, and therefore will always command a price. If the right is attached undivorcably to the possession of say a certain manor or estate, such estate will sell for more money than it would be saleable at *minus* the privilege: and if the owner wishes to sell the privilege and keep the estate, all he will have to do is to sell one field and attach the privilege to it. This is the most palpable way of evasion; no doubt there are many other modes. The sale of next presentations is a practice which might be suppressed with less difficulty; even in the case of these, evasions would be possible. If the possibility which exists of trafficking in rights of presentation is so great an evil that the residence of those rights in private persons ought to be put an end to in order to get rid of that evil, there is no way but one: to buy out the owners at the expense of either the State or the Church. If at the expense of the State, then the patronage of the greater number of the benefices in England will fall to the Crown; if at the expense of the Church, *i.e.*, by taxing the livings to pay for the value of their respective advowsons, then an arrangement for future appointments would have to be devised. Such an arrangement would in all probability be based on popular election. Any alteration of the present system (if that ought to be called system which is one of the most irregular things in the world), will and must include the purchase at a large cost of the rights of proprietors. It is unlikely that the present Parliament, or that any Parliament we are likely to have under present appearances, would consent to the large outlay this would require. I accordingly conclude that if our present system of patronage be replaced by some other, this will be effected at the cost of the Church, and that the new system will be one of popular election.

Before I say anything about the probable effects of such a change, I have a remark to make on some things that were said in the debate of last week. It was said that the right of patronage is a trust, or of the nature of a trust, and that the selling of that right was like the selling of a vote at an election, which is considered by all honest men to be discreditable—a stronger term might be used. But our law, and the public conscience, regard the man who *gives* a bribe for a vote as acting something worse than discreditably; while the person who purchases an advowson is doing nothing wrong in any one's estimation, and may be doing an act very highly praiseworthy. The Simeon trusts were thus established; and the movement was at the time regarded as most patriotic, and as containing the promise of a great reform. The fact is, there is no analogy; the matter is to be treated of properly on grounds of public expedience, and of nothing else; we are without a guiding moral principle in it at all.

Would, then, the replacement of the present system by another, in the manner and with the change which (if I am right) must be adopted, do most harm or good? That, I believe, and I cannot see otherwise, is the main issue which will come before us. In one respect, there is a palpable difficulty—I will not say a fatal one; for if the ultimate and certain good to be done is one of great moral magnitude, a money consideration is inferior in actual importance, and is not to be set against the great moral benefit. But the loss of a fifth part of all the church property in England (I

have heard it placed higher in amount) is not to be undertaken lightly or without strong reason. The point on which all will turn is the mode of appointment. I cannot, in one letter, even attempt to sum up the reasons on each side, in favour of and against, the popular election of our parish clergy; nor do more than observe that a mixed and irregular system—a *no-system* of great variousness such as exists at present, is, of all means that could be devised, the most calculated to produce and develop a variety in the personality of the clergy; and I consider this a good; a good so great that to preserve it we ought to be willing to tolerate the accidental evils which the system does, I admit, involve. It is a good, because chiefly it makes our Church the most catholic, in the true sense, of all churches on the earth.

But if the public opinion of the Church shall come to look on private and irresponsible (irresponsible as that term is commonly used) patronage as such a mischief as must be got rid of, then legislation will of course be called in to help, and the public opinion of the Church will be found irresistible. It will be of no use to point out then that the irresponsibility of a large college of electors is a far more complete irresponsibility than that of a private patron; it will be too late then to point out anything. In the meantime, if general opinion is really taking that road, those who hold that opinion already, in their several parishes and dioceses, have the matter to a large extent in their own hands. If they are willing to see the general fund and estate of the Church lessened by a large percentage, in order to bring about a great moral and political amelioration, they ought to be willing to bear some of the expense themselves. They have the power, if they put their hands in their pockets, to buy up every advowson that is offered for sale; putting it under trust, with such provisions for nomination, by public election or otherwise, as they may think fit. If there were organised, in every diocese, societies for the purpose, and funds raised, a very large number of patrons would be ready to deal with such bodies; on far more liberal terms, too, than they would deal with purchasers who answered an advertisement. Such a movement would in its progress, moreover, be effectual to the promotion of general interest in church affairs, not in its scope merely, but beyond it; and would be largely for the advancement of the Christian commonwealth.

There are other considerations on this subject which I might offer, but I fear to be too long. B.
23rd June, 1884.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR.—I do not wish to raise any enquiry whether "F. T. P." be a layman or a cleric, but I think that when he, very fairly, asks your readers "to lay before them 'Erigena's' letter of the 24th of May, and to read 'his' criticisms after reperusing it," he is guilty of the clerical failing of preaching what he himself has practised very imperfectly. I had written—after speaking of Dr. Hobart's list of 440 words common to Luke and the Greek medical writers, of which 350 are in the New Testament peculiar to Luke, or peculiar to him in a medical sense—"This is not of course asserting any such prodigious phenomenon as that the writings ascribed to St. Luke contain such a host of words elsewhere exclusively medical, which would be to say that the writer's language resembles that of

some doctor in a comedy. By far the greater number of these words were quite current in ordinary Greek. Nevertheless it still remains to be accounted for (making due allowance for accident in some instances), that in some hundreds of instances where St. Luke's vocabulary differs from that of the rest of the New Testament, it agrees with the vocabulary of Greek medical writers." I then enumerated some nine or ten of St. Luke's words which I believed to be outside St. Luke's writings exclusively medical.

Now I ask, Was it commonly fair (I impute no intentional unfairness) to ignore my statement that by far the greater number of the words enumerated by Dr. Hobart were quite current in ordinary Greek? Was it fair when I had specially enumerated the words that I believed to be exclusively medical outside St. Luke's writings, to allege as part of the proof that my words were "men in buckram," that ἀποχωρεῖ, ἐπιβλέπω, ἐξαίφνης, and βελόνη (which I had nowhere claimed as exclusively medical) are found elsewhere? For I think it was likely, however unintentionally, to mislead the reader when "F. T. P." (after stating, correctly enough, that Greek medical language was not technical in the sense of being derived from foreign languages) adds, "This alone discounts enormously from 'Erigena's' proofs. For instance:—Much is made of the term ἀγλός." Except as referring to Dr. Hobart's list of words, I had not mentioned ἀγλός in my letter. I write feelingly, having taken special pains to learn accurately the state of the case, looking out nearly every one of Dr. Hobart's 440 words in the Greek lexicon, to discover as far as I could how far the language of St. Luke was language exclusively medical, and having stated that far the greater number of the words were quite current in ordinary Greek, and having now been answered by "F. T. P." much as if I had said or implied the contrary. Was it fair to write, "Let the Bob Sawyers and Ben Allens talk 'shop' out of school, I cannot believe it of St. Luke"?—when this was almost an echo of my illustration that to claim all the medical words as exclusively medical would be to represent St. Luke as talking like some doctor in a comedy.

Was it fair to write "Another error in conjunction with the first, appears in the medical terminology claimed for St. Luke, and that is of improving (?) upon the simple and unprofessional expressions of the Great Master and his Aramaic *entourage* in Galilee. As well might we be invited to admire fine fresh daubs of paint on a picture by one of the old masters"? I say, was it fair to write the above, when I had neither said nor implied anything about admiration of the phraseology, or about its being improved.

When "F. T. P." writes—"Erigena's imposing Greek vocabulary array will not stand the test of honest criticism. It has been hastily put together without reference to the LXX., and it claims an exhaustive knowledge of medical and common terminology of that day which it does not and cannot possess"—I do not know what he means by "it claims." If he means that I claimed, again, I say, that he has neglected to observe what I said, and that was that having carefully examined Dr. Hobart's sections and Liddell and Scott, I found no proof that any of nine or ten expressions were used outside the writings of St. Luke and medical authors.

There are three instances in which I acknowledge—but to error, as what I said was perfectly accurate—but to receiving additional information from "F. T. P." Namely as to πνοή being used in prose outside

St. Luke, and ἔκστασις in the sense of "trance," being used outside St. Luke, both of them in the LXX., and εὐφορεῖν in Josephus.

As I never said or supposed that the verb συλλαμβίνειν in the sense of *conceiving* appears to be peculiarly medical, "F. T. P.'s statement and mine are in no way opposed. ἀνακαθίξιν in the active voice is generally causal, "to cause to sit up," but is used by medical writers, and by medical writers only, as far as I have yet heard in the sense of "sitting up in bed." Xenophon is quoted as using the verb intransitively in one passage. I nowhere said that there was any special medical way of delivering a letter. The nine or ten expressions which seemed to me exclusively medical, seem so far to be reduced to six or seven.

And now, Mr. Editor, an intelligent reader may ask why I think it worth while alleging the occurrence of words peculiar to Luke in the New Testament which though belonging to the Greek medical writers were also quite current in ordinary Greek. Let me reply by an extract from the life of F. W. Robertson (the passage occurs in a letter in the People's Edition numbered 138).

"A man was robbed. Among the coins he had was a sou, a Portsea token, and another, the name of which I forget, a sort of halfpenny. A man was taken up on suspicion, and in his pocket, with some other money, were three such coins. The prosecutor could only swear that he had had three such. He could not identify, nor could he swear to any of the other pieces. The counsel for the defence proved in evidence that all these coins were extremely common in Brighton, where the robbery took place, and the case seemed to have broken down, by the countenances of the jury. 'Gentlemen,' said the Chief Justice (Sir John Jervis), 'the question has to be tried by the doctrine of chances. A sou is common, a token is common, and the third coin too. The chances are, that perhaps a thousand sous are in the pockets of different people in Brighton; that five-hundred tokens are so too, and perhaps fifteen hundred of the other; but the chances are very great against two men in Brighton having each a sou and a token, and almost infinite against two men having each in his pocket, at the same time, a sou, a token, and the third coin. You must therefore add this to the rest of the evidence not as a weak link but as a very strong one.'"

Now will the reader apply this principle to Luke's description of the case of the demoniac boy? ἐπιβλέπω is a medical term, but also current elsewhere, the "foaming" is mentioned by medical writers as a symptom of epilepsy, but might be noticed by any one; ἐξαίφνης is used by medical writers, but is current elsewhere; ἀποχωρεῖ ditto. Do not all these occurring in one passage give it a medical complexion? Again, does not the large array of three hundred and fifty words peculiar to Luke (or to the writings ascribed to Luke) out of the whole New Testament (some only peculiar in a medical sense), and also current in medical writers, present a very strong link of evidence when examined by the doctrine of chances. Grant that Luke may have got his peculiar use of ἀρχαί out of Euripides, and, if you put his writing so late, assume that he took his use of εὐφορεῖν from Josephus, grant that πυρετός and μέγας taken separately, are each exceedingly common in Greek; suppose my list of words, that I suppose to be exclusively medical, can no longer even say "we are seven;" grant that Dr. Ho-

bart may reckon some words (*γῆρας* is a strong instance), the non-occurrence of which elsewhere in the New Testament is pure accident; but what about the whole 350 words? What is the chance that all these words are peculiar to Luke in the New Testament, also current in medical writers, and that the coincidence is merely accidental? If I were on a jury, my conscience would be a good deal easier deciding on such evidence, than on the evidence from the sou, the token, and the third coin being found together. If any reader will consult Liddell and Scott for *ιατρῆς* (the term applied to St. Luke in Philemon), he will see that the regular and ordinary meaning is *surgeon* or *physician*. It can no doubt, like all other words of the kind, be applied metaphorically, but that it should be so applied with no hint of the metaphor is unlikely. Take the occurrence of the word, and the medical language, and the chances are almost infinite against this supposition, which seems purely coined for the occasion. I should be curious to hear "the cloak that I left at Troas," or "Zenas the lawyer," or "Alexander the coppersmith," expounded on similar principles. By the bye, what does it concern "F. T. P.'s" argument whether Luke was a physician or not," if as "F. T. P." seems to think, the third evangelist did not use specially medical language. *ERIGENA.*

SIR,—In an interesting pamphlet by Dr. Wace on the genuineness of the Gospels, by which I was directed to the study of Dr. Hobart's work on "St. Luke's Medical Language"; some two or three passages are quoted from the writings of M. Renan, in which the opinion is expressed that St. Luke was the author of the Acts and of the third Gospel. That this opinion is solidly supported by evidence I have endeavoured to show; and, to those who accept it, it must be evident that the Gospels that bear the names of Matthew and Mark *could* have been written in the age assigned to them by tradition. That there is an element common to these three Gospels is a matter of fact, and I shall assume, for the present, that they derive this common element, not from one another (at least to any important extent), but from a common source. If any one should desire to maintain the view here rejected of an extensive interdependence among the Gospels, I dare say you, Mr. Editor, will allow him to state his reasons; but for the present I may say, in general, that the amount of variation between parallel narratives, seems to exclude the idea that any one of the Gospels is largely derived from any other. Now the common source of three documents, or of part of each of them, must, of course, be older than any. It follows that, when Luke's Gospel was written, a Gospel history existed in much its present shape as it appears in the Synoptic Gospels; and further we learn from the prefatory words of St. Luke's Gospel that his work was a successor of other similar treatises. The age of Luke, then, was an age in which the tradition common to the Synoptists existed, and it was an age in which many endeavoured to embody in writing the Gospel history delivered by those who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word. If then in the time of St. Luke a history like that contained in the first and second Gospels had taken shape, and if it was a time prolific in written Gospels that embodied in good faith the teaching of the Apostles, we are safe in saying that there is a probability that the three Gospels were written in or about the same period. That the common source of the common portions of their narrative took shape

very early indeed is my own persuasion, for which I shall now endeavour to give reasons. One is struck at the first blush with the different phraseology respecting our Lord in the Gospels as compared with the Epistles and Apocalypse. For instance, in the Epistle of St. James, which may, perhaps, be said to have nearly the least amount of specially Christian doctrine, we find that the writer, who was probably the "brother of the Lord," calls himself "the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and again he speaks of "our Lord Jesus Christ (the Lord) of glory," and talks of the "coming of the Lord." Any reader moderately acquainted with the Epistles will probably acknowledge, what so far as I am aware is undenied and undeniable, that high Christological language of this kind runs through them. On the other hand, in the Gospels our Saviour is generally called simply Jesus; and what is very important, the word "Christ," which is established as a proper name in the writings of St. Paul, generally appears in the Gospels as a sort of appellative which some would then allow, and others deny, to Jesus of Nazareth. Peter said, "Thou art the Christ;" the mockers said, "If thou be Christ," and so forth. In short, the Epistles were written on the understanding that the title of Christ was ascribed to Jesus by all readers; the Gospels, though written for readers with the same belief, are composed in fresh recollection of a time when the claim of our Saviour to that title was seldom made definitely even by Himself, and was a common subject of doubt and debate. It may perhaps seem that this view of the subject is only plausible, inasmuch as the Apocryphal Gospels, which can scarcely be of early date, generally, as far as I recollect, speak of our Lord, only by His name of Jesus. I was rather struck by this fact when I first noticed it, but I now attach comparatively little importance to it. The authors of the Apocryphal Gospels probably have modelled their phraseology in this respect frigidly on the Canonical Gospels; there is, so to speak, no feeling of Christology running through them; but that our Canonical Gospels reflect in some degree the phraseology of their time may be inferred as probable from the fact that the title "the Lord," spoken absolutely of Christ, belongs among the Gospels chiefly to Luke and John, and in Luke it seems specially characteristic of the incidents peculiar to his Gospel (see Luke vii. 13, x. 1, xiii. 15, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 31, 61). I borrow this important argument from Dean Plumptre's Commentary, endorsing his inference that St. Luke collected these additional particulars at a time when this manner of naming our Saviour was more established,—at least established among St. Luke's informants; and it may be further inferred that the materials common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke had taken their form at an earlier period. It is worth noting in this connection how Paul speaks when he touches on the Gospel history in 1 Cor. xi.: he tells "how the Lord Jesus in the same night that He was betrayed took bread," and so forth; and in 1 Cor. xv., how "Christ died for our sins,—and that he was raised again the third day and seen of Cephas, then of the twelve," and by the rest. In 1 Cor. vii., Paul appears to be referring to the discourses of Christ, when he explains where he has, and where he has not, a "commandment of the Lord." May I remark, in passing, that "F. T. P." seems to me to go on very uncertain ground, when he argues from the titles of "Word" and "Only-begotten" not being ascribed to Christ in so short a treatise as the *Διδαχὴ*, that Christ was "not yet"

the "Word" or the "Only-begotten." I cannot tell whether or not these titles were known to the author of the *Διδαχή*, but not to assume the genuineness of the fourth Gospel or the Epistle that we call the First Epistle of John, the title "Word of God," with other very high titles, is ascribed to our Lord in the Apocalypse, chap. xix. 13.

I have a further reason for thinking it probable that the common materials of the Synoptic Gospels took shape at a very early period, and that is the resemblance in the form in which they are presented. Once the Apostles were scattered from Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, it seems humanly speaking inevitable that a wide difference of phraseology and of selection of incidents would have arisen—one relating, *inter alia*, the mighty works done in Chorazin, or another those done in other towns and villages,—unless the form of the history had previously become stereotyped. I infer that it had become stereotyped, probably in an oral tradition, assisted perhaps by written notes, before the martyrdom of James, the brother of John; that is, that the material common to the first three Gospels had thus become largely stereotyped in form.

From such considerations of internal evidence I proceed to speak of the earliest external evidence to Matthew and Mark. I refer, of course, to the testimony of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, and author of the Exposition of the Dominical Oracles. He is said by Dean Plumptre to have died A.D. 170; but if so, it must, I think, have been in extreme old age, since his life appears to have overlapped with that of personal disciples of Christ. I do not here refer to the very disputable statement of Irenæus that Papias was a hearer of the Apostle John, since Eusebius is careful to tell us (Eccl. Hist. iii. xxxix) that this was nowhere claimed in the writings of Papias himself; but I refer to the words of Papias, quoted by Eusebius in the same chapter, to the effect that on meeting any follower of the elders he "used to ask" what Andrew or what Peter *said* (*εἶπεν*), or what Philip or what Thomas or James (*εἶπεν*), or what John or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and the things which (*ἃ ἔειπεν*) Aristion and John the elder, the disciples of the Lord, *said* (*λέγουσιν*). The change of tense from the aorist to the present seems to mark that Aristion and "John the elder" had been alive in Papias's time, and that they had been alive when Papias was making his inquiries, and these two men are called by Papias "disciples of the Lord," a title which in the above passage they share with the Apostles enumerated in it. It certainly appears to mean that they were personal followers of Christ.

The testimony, then, of a writer who had lived and made inquiries about "the words of the elders," at a time when personal disciples of Christ were still alive, cannot but be of high importance; and the account given of the origin of Mark's Gospel is given on the authority of "the elder," who, from the context in Eusebius, appears to be "John the elder." "And the elder said (or 'used to say,' *εἶλεγε*), this; Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately all that he remembered" (or "all that he" (Peter) "related"): he did not, however, write *in order* the things said or done by Christ, for he did not hear the Lord, or follow Him, &c. The above is not the whole passage, but it gives the testimony and the one point on which controversy regarding it is based, viz., the statement that Mark did not write "in order." It is contended, and apparently with truth, that Mark's

Gospel is as much in order, or more in order than Matthew or Luke; and it is supposed by some that "the elder" must have been describing an original Gospel of Mark different from the present one. To this it may be replied that "John the elder" may have thought the order in Matthew more authoritative as coming from an Apostle, or that he may very possibly have had some incidents present in his own recollection in a different order from that given by St. Mark. It seems to me possible, on this latter supposition, that "John the elder" had questioned St. Mark or his friends on the subject, and received from St. Mark or his friends the account that he gives of Mark's taking notes with all accuracy from teaching given by St. Peter, as need arose (*πρὸς τὰς χρείας*), but not given as making a connected history (*σύνταξιν*) of the words of Christ. Be this as it may, I think that if a reader will try to face the problem how Mark's Gospel could have been altered into a more accurate order, which is neither wholly that of Matthew or Luke, he will come to the conclusion that it is far simpler to suppose that Papias and "John the elder" spoke of no other than our present second Gospel. It seems to the last degree unlikely that this Gospel could have been altered unknown to Papias, whose later contemporaries, such as Irenæus and Tatian, looked on the existence of our four Gospels, it would seem, as an established fact; Irenæus looking on it as a kind of sacred necessity. I confess to more difficulty about Papias's account of St. Matthew, viz., "Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, but each man interpreted them as he could." Those who are wise in such matters seem to think that our present Matthew is not a translation. Dr. Westcott suggests that we have the representative rather than the exact reproduction of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. What the original history of the Gospel may be, I cannot pretend to decide; but I feel little doubt that Papias spoke of our present Gospel, which can scarcely have been changed between the times of Papias and Irenæus, and in the days of Irenæus our present Gospel of Matthew was established throughout Christendom. We have, moreover, the important quotation from Matthew in the Epistle of Barnabas, introduced with the usual formula for a quotation from Scripture, "It is written," the quotation being, "many are called, but few chosen." As far as the teaching of the twelve Apostles is concerned, accepting, for the present, under protest "F. T. P.'s" impression that it deals only with oral tradition, not with written Gospels, I would suggest that, on any hypothesis which admits the truth of Papias's account of two Gospels written respectively by Matthew and Mark, the difficulty raised would be same. If the teaching does not quote *any* written Gospels, obviously it does not quote the real or supposed original Matthew or original Mark. If the silence of the teaching cannot disprove the existence of these, it obviously cannot disprove the existence of our present Gospels. For my own part, while I hesitate to go as far as Farrar does in saying that "it may be regarded as absolutely certain that" the writer of the *Διδαχή* "was familiar with St. Matthew in whole or in part," I still think it very likely that he was so familiar. If you compare the teaching of the twelve Apostles with the Catechism of the Church of England, the former seems to have stronger traces of the knowledge of St. Matthew than the latter. Both have the Lord's Prayer and Baptism in the name of the Trinity, which in both periods alike may

have been matters of ordinary church-teaching ; but besides the coincidences with the sermon on the mount in the "Way of Life," which "F. T. P." has described and partly quoted, the writer of the *Διδαχή*, in forbidding to give the Eucharist to the unbaptised, adds, "for respecting this the Lord hath said, 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs,'"—words which occur among documents known to us only in the sermon on the mount. I hope any readers who can will read over Farrar's translation and notes, as the latter seem to point out a fair probability that the writer of the *Διδαχή* was acquainted with the writings of St. Luke. I think "F. T. P." is quite mistaken in supposing that the *Διδαχή* describes any gift of tongues ecstatic and unintelligible, the only foundation I can discover being Farrar's note, "This phrase" (namely, "in the spirit") "has a special meaning, partly originating in the charism of the 'tongue' (glossolagy), but afterwards extending to all lofty, rapt, and 'inspired' teaching." But utterances described in the teaching as given "in the spirit" seem to have been very intelligible indeed. "Whosoever says in the spirit 'Give me some money' or anything else, ye shall not listen to him ; but if he tell you to give on behalf of others who lack, let no man judge him." I fear that among those who pretended to be prophets there must have been some rogues in those days, and one is glad to find that the Christians were warned against these "Christ-traffickers." I hope to proceed with the evidence for the early date of the Gospels in my next letter.

ERIGENA.

Reviews and Notices.

"WAS PAUL CRUCIFIED FOR YOU?" "THE UNKNOWN SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST." Two Sermons preached by the Right Rev. Francis Jeune, D.C.L., late Lord Bishop of Peterborough. London: The Church of England Book Society. Price 4d.

THESE two very able discourses well deserve the careful perusal of our subscribers. The former was preached before the University of Oxford, December 6th, 1863, when Dr. Jeune was Vice-Chancellor ; the latter was preached at St. George's, Leicester, October 9th, 1864. The writer sets forth the blessed truth, Christ as man's substitute, that Christ claims our love because "He loved us and gave Himself for us." There may be difficulties to some minds, but, as Dr. Jeune states, it is the very essence of faith firmly to believe on sufficient grounds, that is on Divine authority, and that the sole question between a Christian and a sceptic is whether the Bible be the Word of God ; and the only question between Christians is as to the meaning of God's Word. He proves that the only truth that gives happiness on a death-bed is that Christ died in the stead of sinners, and the perfect unity between Christ and the believer, "Mine the sin, His the penalty; His the shame, mine the glory; His the thorn, mine the crown; His the merit, mine the reward." The writer reminds us that "our part is to believe and adore, not to explain, much less explain away the deep things of God," and that we should be content to reverence the secret things which belong to God, and to live by the doctrines revealed for us and for our children.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bond, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Anderby ; Prebendary of Louth, in Lincoln Cathedral.
Cottle, Rev. James John H., B.A., Curate of Bremhill, Calne, Wiltshire ; Vicar of Christ Church, Henley, near Rochdale.
Digges, Rev. Dudley, Vicar of Compton, Chamberlayne, Wilts.
France-Hayhurst, Rev. T. W. H., Rector of Davenham, Northwich.
Gilson, Rev. S., Vicar of Pelsall, formerly Archdeacon of Montreal ; Vicar of Hixon.
Hadden, Rev. R. H., Assistant-Curate of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate ; Chaplain to Mr. G. F. Phillips, Sheriff-Elect of London and Middlesex.
Harrison, Rev. William Graydon, Rector of Bacton.
Hayward, Rev. S. G., Curate of Chipping Norton ; Vicar of Monk Hopton, Salop.
Heard, Rev. John Bickford, Incumbent of St. John's Parochial Chapel, Caterham.
Houghton, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Ashill.
Lester, Rev. W. H., M.A., Diocesan Missioner in Lichfield Diocese ; Prebendary of Whittrington, in Lichfield Cathedral.
Lea, Rev. Charles Beaumont, Rector of Wyham-with-Cadeby.
Luxmoore, Rev. Charles Coryndon, M.A., Vicar of Lapley-with-Wheaton, Aston.
McLean, Rev. Thomas Bithel, Curate ; Perpetual Curate of St. Paul, Skelmersdale.
Minshull, Rev. T. E., M.A., Chaplain at Rhydd Court, Hanley Castle.
Pilling, Rev. William, M.A., Incumbent of Ribbleton, near Preston.
Purcell, Rev. Lionel T., Vicar of St. Paul's, Exeter ; Vicar of Watchet.
Savory, Rev. Arnold Wordsworth, Vicar of Worlaby.
Sharp, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Long Cross, Chertsey ; Vicar of Addlestone, Surrey.
Thomas, Rev. Henry, Senior Assistant-Master of Ardingly College, and Curate of Nutley ; Vicar of Wivelsfield, Sussex.
Vinter, Rev. R. Kater, Head Master of Kimbolton Grammar-school ; Vicar of Kimbolton.
Wheeler, Rev. Horace N., Rector of St. Michael, Caerhays ; Rural Dean of St. Austell.
White, Rev. Darius James, B.A., Vicar of Burgh-cum-Wintherpe.
Yeatman, Rev. Huyshe W., Vicar of Sydenham, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury ; Honorary Canon of Rochester Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Austin, Rev. William, Rural Dean, at St. John's Rectory Essequibo, British Guiana, on the 17th May, aged 84.
Birch, Rev. Henry Mildred, B.D., Rector of Prestwich, Canon of Ripon, Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty, and Chaplain to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, at St. Leonard's Lodge, Windsor, on the 29th ult., aged 64.
Biscoe, Rev. Charles Thomas, youngest son of the late Rev. Robert Biscoe, Rector of Whitbourne, Herefordshire, at Emscote, Warwick, on St. Peter's Day, aged 37.
Browne, Rev. W. A. Dillon, eldest son of the son of the late Colonel J. Dillon Browne, of Charlton Barrow, Dorset, at Bath, on St. Peter's Day.
Curme, Rev. Thomas, at the Vicarage, Sandford St. Martin, on the 23rd ult., aged 78.
Elliott, Rev. William Henry, Vicar, at Stainton-in-Cleveland, on the 19th ult., aged 66.
Harvey, Edmund George, Priest, at Mullyon Vicarage, Cornwall, on the 21st ult., aged 56.
Harte, Rev. J. W., B.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Old Ford, E., on the 24th ult., aged 65.
Howell, Rev. George, R.D., Rector of Llangattock and Llangenny, Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Beaufort, K.G., on the 28th ult., aged 74.
Sinnott, Rev. John, Rector of the parish, R.D. of Emlyn, and Proctor in Convocation for the diocese of St. David's, at Penboyr, Carmarthenshire, on the 29th ult., aged 64.
Stuart, Rev. Alexander Voules, Vicar of Nettleham, Lincoln, at Bury St. Edmund's, on the 25th ult., aged 73.
Watts, Rev. William, Vicar of Linkinhorne, Cornwall, and late Vicar of Hilton, Yorks, suddenly, at the Waterloo Railway Station, ten days after the death of his brother, on the 21st ult.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE FALL.

BY THE VERY REV. C. P. REICHEL, D.D., DEAN
OF CLONMACNOIS AND RECTOR OF TRIM, CO.
MEATH.

SERMON PREACHED AT TRIM ON SEXAGESIMA,
1884.

"So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubim and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."—GEN. iii. 24.

THE history we have heard in the first lesson this morning is one of the most singular and, at the same time, one of the most deeply instructive in the Bible. It is generally called the history of the Fall of man, though it is observable that Scripture never calls it so. Indeed, some persons have thought it ought rather to be called the history of the rise of man—of his ascent in the scale of creation. And in one sense this view is not incorrect; for before it the two human beings who are presented to us as the founders of our race seem to have been in much the same state as the beasts; they felt no shame; whereas their very first feeling when they had done the act, whatever it was, was one of shame, leading to the first attempt to difference themselves from the beasts around them. They made themselves aprons of fig leaves, not for warmth, but as a covering.

But this view, though not altogether wrong, does not convey the whole truth on the subject. The rise from the state of perfect unconscious innocence which they shared with the animals that surrounded them, and which the animals still possess—for they have no consciousness of wrongdoing, no consciousness of sin nor therefore of guilt—might have been attained in another way to that in which it actually was. They might have become conscious moral agents without transgression. And it was undoubtedly the Divine purpose, so far as we can understand the narrative, that they should do so. Had they kept the command of God, had they abstained from eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, we are, I think, to conclude that God would have revealed to them the knowledge of good without their acquiring the experience of evil as a set-off to it; and then they would have shared in some degree the nature of Him to whom evil is so utterly abhorrent, that He is declared to be of purer eyes than even to behold iniquity—as if the countenance of God, His look, so to speak,

Vol. XVIII.—No. 446.

annihilated evil, so that it was banished from His sight, or rather extirpated at once by His very glance. This is an altogether higher stage, not merely than the stage of brutish unconscious innocence, where there is no sin, because there is no consciousness of law nor of responsibility, but than the stage on which mankind now stand—a stage of existence deeply conscious of moral good and evil, but in which that consciousness does not involve the doing of what is good.

We are not justified, therefore, in considering the so-called Fall of man as a mere rise in the scale of being—a necessary step in evolution. And this even irrespective of the sacred narrative, which certainly leaves the stamp of guilt, because of disobedience, on our progenitors. But what is most important to remark is this, that supposing the whole narrative to be blotted out of Scripture altogether, as well as the two allusions to it in St. Paul's writings, which are the only allusions ever made to it in the rest of the sacred books, the fact of which it gives a symbolical account would still remain. If we had never heard of the garden of delight—for that is what Eden means,—or of the tree of life, or of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, we should still have to account for the patent fact that we, human beings, display this most curious and unsatisfactory characteristic, differencing us from the inferior animals, that, whilst we know the difference between moral good and moral evil, we so often choose the last, perfectly aware what it is; that we see and approve things excellent, as the apostle says, and yet do the things which are not excellent; that there is a law within us working against the law of God, and inclining us preponderatingly to sin.

The modern system which is so fashionable now under the name of evolution, and which supposes that the human race is simply a development, by natural forces and methods, from some lower animal of form now extinct and altogether missing, indeed,—this last fact being a rather weak point in the hypothesis—this modern system finds itself in this respect confronted with a puzzling difficulty. No sense of sin or guilt, abstractedly, is perceivable in brutes. They are naked—to express this in Scripture language—and they are not ashamed. They are utterly unconscious of any moral purpose, or any feeling therewith connected. Shame, reverence, sin, guilt, are thoughts or feelings by which they are wholly unaffected. Now, this being so, if man is merely a development from some lost form of them, whence do these feelings arise in his breast? And in the breast of no human being are they entirely wanting. Again, beasts fulfil their purpose perfectly, so far as we can see; and they fulfil it unchangingly and unimprovingly. There is no symptom of their learning anything. There is no difference between the structure of a honeycomb now and what it was thousands of thousands of years ago. The first bees that stored honey in

waxen compartments, seem to have stored it exactly in the same way as their progeny of a million generations store it. They have never altered; they have never improved. But man is altogether different. He never fulfils his purpose—the purpose of which he is quite conscious—perfectly. Not to speak of that highest purpose, the purpose of knowing and serving God, of which only the higher specimens of man can be said to be fully conscious—for though much talked of, it is little felt—confining ourselves to the lower purposes of providing for himself and those belonging to him in the best way, of going through life not uselessly nor wretchedly, we plainly see that these purposes are, on the whole, very imperfectly fulfilled. And then the feeling of responsibility, the feeling, when we do certain things, that we are doing wrong, the perpetual balance between not merely *opposing* but *competing* modes of action, in the decision between which the time of action too frequently escapes us,—all these things, of which life is absolutely full, are so utterly out of the range of animal life—the very aiming at improvement, if not at perfection, involves such endless and disastrous failure, and all this is so alien from the bestial life, which, if it does not improve, does not retrograde,—that one is puzzled to account for it, if man be a mere stage in animal evolution. If we had not the history of the Fall, we should be forced to form some hypothesis to account for the present state of things, which is so strange and yet so familiar.

Brought face to face with this difficulty, evolutionists have adopted several ways of meeting it. Some deny that there is such a thing as free will and free action and consequent responsibility. This solution I myself heard more than hinted in an address given by Professor Huxley ten years ago. In that address he led up to the conclusion that all our actions were merely automatic, purely mechanical; that we could not help them; thus coming by another road to the same conclusion as Jonathan Edwards, who argued that the supremacy of God involved the impotence of man to evade what the Deity has fore-ordained, and that therefore, the predestination of God covering His whole creation, all our actions, even the most sinful, are simply the inevitable result of the Divine decree. But the consciousness of every individual human being that he is at each moment free to do or not to do the particular act which the moment brings before him is too strong to be overpowered, whether by physiological or metaphysical or theological speculations. If that consciousness deceive us, we cannot be sure we are not deceived by every other consciousness; and therefore all knowledge of truth must be resigned, and universal pyrrhonism must reign. The automatist and the Calvinist are equally refuted by that inner feeling whose revelations are simply necessary to our existence. People cannot in the long run hold theories which

are inconsistent with the universal consciousness of man.

Another way of getting out of the difficulty is to deny the guilt or the existence of *sin*. Sin is a bugbear, an unreality. There can be no such thing. It is a superstition which in due time will vanish, as fetish-worship vanishes before an enlarged knowledge of nature and of ourselves as part of nature. At the worst, sin is only a mistake, arising from not clearly seeing our proper functions in relation to the society in which the human animal finds the requisites for his comfort and satisfaction. He is bound to do the best for himself, no doubt; but, as he gets better informed, he will see that he cannot do the best for himself, except by doing the best for others: any violation of this rule is sin in the only true sense of that word, according to the new philosophy; and when the rule is clearly seen by all, when the race has been educated up to it, sin will vanish, as being opposed to enlightened self-interest.

This is Mr. Herbert Spencer's doctrine; and it is not quite so bad as that of Calvin and Huxley. But it ignores facts quite as much as they do. It supposes that enlightened self-interest can and will ultimately develop universal obedience to the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Now ask yourselves, is it possible that *love* should ever be created by *self-interest*? Did a man ever yet *love* another simply because it was very much for his interest to do so? Is the love of a friend nothing but self-interest? Is not the bare statement of such an idea enough to cover it with ridicule and contempt? Love, as every one knows who knows what love is, love is not to be so created. It is not to be manufactured, however gradually, out of selfishness. I suppose that some consciousness of this absurdity has led the framers of this hypothesis to invent the queer word, *altruism*, to denote love of others supposed to be thus generated—a word coined out of the Italian language, because English and even Greek were not capable of furnishing an expression for the thought intended to be conveyed. When philosophers are driven to such shifts, it is tantamount to a confession of defeat. We want no altruistic affection for our fellows, which is not affection, but mere calculation of advantage. We want no such Italian refinements; no such substitutions for the clear, simple, sturdy morality which, thank God, has been hitherto the morality of the English race.

Another cognate objection to this theory of enlightened selfishness is that, whereas this theory supposes that an enlightened calculation of one's own greatest happiness is the basis of morality, the highest acts of morality—those which the consent of mankind has agreed to call *heroic*—have been done not only without any such calculation, but in the teeth of it. The men who died for their country in past ages—the Spartans at Thermopylæ, the Romans at the Lake Regillus, the Jews under the Macca-

bees, the Swiss at Morgarten, the English at Waterloo,—these men made no such calculation. Had they made it, they never would have given their lives for their country and its liberties. For no self-interest can go beyond one's own *life*, if this life be all, as these modern philosophers tell us that it is. If there be no God to serve, no life beyond the grave to hope for, no duty higher than self-interest to perform, it is all over with heroism; the age which has imbibed this doctrine will do nothing great. We may then read the history of the past with what I should conceive even the most enlightened physiologists must feel—an inner sense of humiliation; with the sense that those ignorant, half-savage, superstitious people of former days did, in consequence of their very ignorance, deeds to which our superior knowledge forbids us to aspire. We too, it seems, shall have risen in the scale of creation by *falling*. "When I was a child, I thought as a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child," said Paul. And so these philosophers may say, "We were children once, and then we thought heroic thoughts, and did heroic deeds; but now, thank God (if there be a God), we are men enlightened beyond anything so childish as heroism; and we do no more such deeds, which are altogether inconsistent with our enlightened standard of morality." This is what England will come to—I speak of England as to Englishmen, knowing that all here are such by descent, if not by locality of birth—this is what England will come to, if the materialistic unbelief which has come of late years into vogue shall gain the day against the old, foolish, fond traditions of the Bible.

Reverting, then, to the story of the first sin narrated in what is commonly called the account of the Fall of man, I think it discloses to us the truth which I shall now endeavour to express, and which is necessary, in order to explain the singular position of the human race. It discloses to us that man, in his first progenitors, was exposed to a probation probably necessary to the moral maturity of every creature gifted with a moral faculty. This probation is of course symbolically described in the 3rd of Genesis. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil,—the tree of life,—the menace of death,—the serpent,—are all symbolic: of the last, indeed, we are expressly told that he is the Devil; the strange and awful antagonist of God, as the name Satan means the power or person who, possibly; throughout creation, resists the will of God. The prohibition to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil seems to mean that God forbade man doing something, no matter what the act might be, so that man felt it was forbidden by one who had a right to forbid. Had that prohibition been obeyed, man's knowledge of good and evil would have been acquired in the same way as our

Saviour's was, by refusing to comply with the temptation. It is often said by way of taunt against the Bible narrative, "What! sentence a man to death for eating an apple?" Just so, if he felt that eating an apple was contrary to the will of God. For what is the death meant? Not death of the body certainly; for then the menace of it was a lie. If death of the soul, we know what that is from our Saviour's declaration that life consists in knowing God. Of course, as I was saying before, this representation of the first sin is altogether symbolical. But, to compare Adam's temptation with our Lord's, have none of you been ever inclined to think that there can really have been no great harm in the suggestion that He should turn one of the stones that lay around Him into bread, to keep Himself from famishing? Does not the life seem worth preserving, when the means of preserving it were so easy? Might it not have been His duty to preserve it? Christ had but to use His divine power, and the thing was done—in a moment; and who would be the worse of it?

It is one of the most apparently innocent of all suggestions.

But our Lord felt that to do this would have swerved from His enterprise. He came absolutely to renounce Himself; to give up His life, if need were, for the good of man. Had He been allowed to perish in the wilderness, it would but have anticipated by a few years the cross. It was the law He set to Himself, *never* to exert his power on *His own* behalf. And therefore, having fully realised the nature of His mission, and how He was to carry it out, He resigned Himself in the wilderness to death by starvation, if it should so please His Father, just as three years after He resigned Himself to death by crucifixion.

Had Adam, the first man, obeyed His Creator as Christ did His Heavenly Father, he would, in the very act of resisting the devil, have obtained that knowledge of good and evil which he longed for, and he would have obtained it, as Christ obtained it, *without losing his innocence*. And, in all probability, he would have transmitted to his posterity that higher nature, which he would thus have acquired, unimpaired. The partisans of evolution must not shrink from their own doctrines, when they become inconvenient to them. They lay enormous stress on what they call *heredity*, by which novel word they mean the transmission of qualities by natural descent. And Scripture quite agrees with them on this point. The doctrine that we are shapen in iniquity, and that in sin did our mothers conceive us,—the doctrine of transmitted, inherited sinfulness, in other words,—is nothing but one particular application of the doctrine of heredity. Not sin itself is transmitted; that is nonsense; acts cannot be transmitted, nor can their guilt; every sinner sins for himself, and for his own acts of sin alone

is he responsible. But the *disposition* to sin is clearly inheritable, just like any other inherited quality of family and race; and therefore sin having once effected a lodgment in our race, it follows that the tendency to it *must* transmit itself in greater or less intensity to all its members.

Let me here remark how absolutely this doctrine of heredity (an old friend with a new name, indeed) corroborates the superhuman nature of our Lord. Had He been merely a man, born by natural descent of the royal race of David, and brought up as He was in the seclusion of an Oriental village, at a mechanical employment, it is not merely inconceivable, it is *impossible* that He should have developed the character we find ineffaceably impressed upon the Gospels. It is confessed by all that no such character appeared before, or has appeared since, on earth: His followers could never have invented or imagined it. Its absolutely unexampled nature stamps it as actual. *But if Jesus was a mere man, the doctrine of heredity is violated by it.* Either, then, this doctrine is false, or Jesus was more than a mere Man:—He was “*the Son of Man*”—the ideal Man up to the highest potency of human nature; but this He could only be because He was more—because He was the Son of God.

I have gone into considerations which are probably seldom dealt with in the pulpit. One reason is, that preachers look in general with so much horror on these new philosophies, that they cannot prevail on themselves to notice them officially; they are so unchristian, that they should be put aside altogether. I fear this is not a satisfactory reason for their silence touching them. These theories pervade life now-a-days; every one hears of them: thousands are made uneasy by them, not the less because clergymen seldom or never handle them. Their omitting to do so is set down to perplexity—to incompetence perhaps; and so the silence of the pulpit is doing mischief, allowing belief to be extensively sapped. I have therefore deliberately chosen to speak on this subject in a manner outside the usual common-places of theology. The scribe instructed for the kingdom of heaven, says Christ, must be like a steward who brings out of his store-room things *new* as well as old.

If we ask what is the *practical* outcome of the story of the Fall, or of the doctrine of transmitted sinfulness, I think one great practical result of it, strange as it may sound, is ENCOURAGEMENT. I take it for granted that every soul here present is conscious of being occasionally guilty of acts which he feels are sinful. Sin is universal. Now if our race be really without any predisposing cause towards it, how is this universal sinfulness to be accounted for? And what a frightful thing it is to think that, absolutely without cause, each human being becomes more or less guilty in the sight of God during his life, be it long or short,—unless,

indeed, it terminate in mere infancy! The doctrine of those who will not hear of hereditary sinfulness is, I think, the most terrible of all conceptions. It represents our race as being, *without predisposing cause*, so constituted as that no one member of it can be pointed out as having gone with absolute innocence through life. What a conception is this! how strange and unaccountable!—how fearful! But if we believe, as the Bible seems to teach, that there is a certain taint running through it, which is yet foreign to its true nature; that the soul is not exactly the sheet of blank paper, on which may be inscribed whatever characters experience shall set down, but is already in some way blurred to begin with; then, the idea of the general, or rather the universal, sinfulness of man loses much of its inexplicability and, consequently, much of its horror. We are, indeed, in that case guilty, each one of us, but not so guilty as we should be did we sin gratuitously, with no hereditary predisposition to it. Our strange weakness, our proneness to go wrong, is not altogether our own individual *fault*. An inherited, transmitted tendency accounts for sin, and palliates though it does not excuse it; it is a reason for merciful judgment, a reason for possible retrieval. And so the doctrine of *original sin*, or rather *original sinfulness*, instead of being the degrading bugbear it is often represented, is in reality fraught with comfort. The inner bias is a thing we cannot help; and we feel instinctively that God will not forget its existence. “He understandeth our frame; He remembereth that we are but dust.”

But it may serve to hearten us also in another way.

If we feel drawn towards what is good, if we feel a deep internal approbation of things really excellent, we may be sure that this evinces our not being abandoned, helpless, to the overwhelming propensions of our inherited degradation. For it proves that, however far gone from original righteousness, or rather innocence, we may be, the image of God is not effaced within us. And if this be so, we may be sure that nothing can efface it, short of our own deliberate wish to do so. Is there one here who would really wish to do so?—to remake himself in the likeness of Satan? I cannot think it, though some sins there are which go near that most awful wish. But here, in this church, corrupt as we all are, and thoughtless as most of us are far too much, I cannot fancy that there is one who would deliberately say, “Evil, be thou my good.” So long as we do not say this in thought or act, we are not beyond the reach of that wonderful mercy and lovingkindness which stands at the door of each heart and knocks. Let us not refuse entrance to that heavenly visitor!

STATIONS of the Church Army have been opened at Lambeth, Bermondsey, and Forest Gate.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1884.

THE DIACONATE.

THE important debate at the recent meeting of the York Convocation on this important subject, and the various speeches which were made, both by the Bishops and Clergy, show that there is a strong feeling that something definite should be done, and that the matter should not end in mere debates and the passing of resolutions. There are circumstances which show how important it is that in these days the Church should lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes—the immense increase in the population, the opening out of new hives of industry, and the utter incapability to provide adequate ministrations for these multitudes, or the scattered population in outlying hamlets, who are far removed from their parish church, and where it is a great inconvenience for the vicar or rector, if he be single-handed, to supply regular ministrations for them, and very often these livings are so poor that it is a sheer impossibility to provide the help of a curate, and the Clerical Aid Societies, which make grants, feel that the large over-grown parishes ought to be their first care, and so are unable to make the grant so earnestly pleaded for, and the result is that many are perhaps lost to the influence of the Church, which a little elasticity would have prevented. It has been proposed by some to establish a new order of sub-deacons, and by others to extend the Diaconate so that laymen should be ordained who have no thought of proceeding to a higher grade, and who might follow their daily secular avocations. Surely it is possible for men to be diligent in business, fervent in spirit, and yet at the same time to serve the Lord even in this high and holy work of ministering to the needs of souls, feeding them with food out of the Word of God, and upholding Christ crucified before men. We want lay help, and also that such lay help should be directed into a proper channel, because, if it be but rightly used it may be a great lever for good in the future. While recognising the urgent necessity and importance of this work, great care must be exercised in the presentation of men for the office, for if it should happen that some who were unfit should be appointed, grave scandal

might arise, because the ignorance and inconsistency of a professor, especially in a recognised office, would be a great stumbling-block to others; but with proper safeguards we believe that the extension of the Diaconate would be of great benefit to the Church. If we look at other communions, although we have no wish to copy from them, yet we can see that they have been wise in their day and generation, and have utilised lay help. Where would Wesleyanism in all its varied forms be without its Local Preachers and Class Leaders? They supply, however inadequately, a much needed help with a regular itinerant ministry, and with large circuits it is impossible that one or two itinerant ministers can visit every little place, and so the Local Preacher goes to the out-of-the-way places in his turn, and no one is allowed to exercise his gift even as a Local Preacher until he has passed through a period of probation. The Roman Church has its minor orders, who have their appointed work in attending to some part of the Church and Divine Service. The Congregationalists and Baptists have their deacons, who take charge of the secular matters, and if we mistake not, in some places, when a vacancy in the pastorate occurs, the senior deacon occasionally conducts the service. In citing these instances we do not wish to say that the Church of England should imitate the ways of the various sects, but we believe that there are many men, who if only sought out, would be glad to help in this work, and with the authority which would, if given to them, be a mark of their fitness for their work, they might help with great advantage in many ways—supplying the Word of Life in outlying hamlets in our country parishes, helping the mission chapels in our crowded districts, and even reading the prayers in the parish church when need should so require. There is also another reason why this work should be commenced and that is this. We are constantly told that the supply of candidates for holy orders is not equal to the demand, and even as it is what is the prospect (taken in a worldly point of view) for young men taking orders in the Church of England? It is said that other professions hold out greater inducements, and that is to a great extent the reason why so many do not come forward; but what has a curate to look forward to after the labour of some years? He may possibly fall in with a living of £300 a year and a house, but it is probable that it may be a great deal less, and if he looks into the matter he will see that a great many remain unbeneficed, men who have done good work, and who have no chance of preferment, and also that there are it is said some 6,000 unattached clergy, and again that agricultural depression has reduced the value of many livings to a merely nominal sum, so small that men cannot accept them unless they are possessed of private means, and looking forward into the future we have been

told by one in authority, that he would be a brave man that would say "that disestablishment is not at least a possibility," and with the confusion that would follow we confess that we are not surprised that many men do not take orders. Let us use the men that we have, let us utilise lay help in this extension of the Diaconate—men who will willingly help and be glad in this way to show their love for the Church. Never, even with all the strife of tongues, has there been more earnestness among our lay members than at the present time; let us use and direct it in a proper way so that it shall be a tower of strength to the Church in the future.

THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED TO A CLERICAL MEETING BY THE REV. THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL, D.D., RECTOR OF SHANKHILL (LURGAN), AND CHAPLAIN TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND.

WHEN one has been trained from his earliest days to regard the Holy Scriptures as "the Word of God," and, consequently, to receive every statement therein as true, and to bow to every precept as the command of God, and to shrink from the wilful disobedience of any, even the least, and ever to appeal to them to decide controversy, it cannot but be a most painful shock to his feelings to hear their testimony questioned, and their authority weakened, if not positively denied. And this not by the sceptic and the scoffer—we expect this—but by those who are of the household of faith, who own as their God the God of the Bible, and whose Saviour is the Christ of the Bible. I need not delay to prove that such is the case at the present day; it is too painfully evident to all. As to some portions of the book, we are told they are unhistorical—a parliamentary expression for untrue; as to others, they are unscientific—a would-be wise way of saying the same; others are inaccurately expressed—a secret which we of this enlightened age have somehow or other discovered; and there are discrepancies: the result of all these adverse criticisms being to discredit its authority as the revelation of divine truth, and as "the lamp to our feet, and the light to our path." Can it for one moment be doubted, that if the authority of the Scriptures be questioned, shaken in the least, they cease practically to be the true light either as to dogma or conduct? If we are to bring our "verifying faculty" to decide how much of the Scriptures, or how little, is given by inspiration of God, do we not open the door to the conclusion that none is so given, and that we may accept as much as pleases our fancies, or reject the whole as a myth?

To those who reject the divine origin of the Scriptures I have nothing now to say: my strictures are for those who to any extent recognise them as a Revelation from God. Of too many even of these I fear it cannot be predicated that, in the language of Isaiah, "they tremble at His word" (lxvi. 5). They do not submit to the decision of that word in every case of controversy, nor do they bow in obedience to every precept and injunction; and in refusal and disobedience they feel no sense of sin. All this, I am con-

strained to believe, arises from an imperfect conception of the authority which attaches to the Scriptures. It is of importance, then, that we—may I say?—delineate that authority, and show that it is absolute, supreme, admitting no rival whatsoever, even as the authority of the Creator over the creatures of His hand.

How shall I best proceed to treat of this authority? Must it not be by an appeal to the Scriptures themselves? What is contained in their pages on the subject? What do the writers say about themselves and their compositions? What is the character of references by the later writers? And, chiefest of all, how were the Scriptures regarded, and treated, and quoted by our blessed Lord Himself?

But, *in limine*, a question arises, What are the Holy Scriptures? What is included in this designation? I am happy to feel that in an assembly of clergymen of the Church of Ireland I am not required to spend much time, or to expend much labour, in giving a sufficient and satisfactory answer. We have, all of us, each for himself, already decided the question. Our Sixth Article which we have all accepted, and on our acceptance of which, as a condition and pledge, we received our commission as ministers of the Church, taking in our hand from the ordaining bishop a copy of the book, "the Bible," and receiving "authority to preach the word of God"—the Bible and the Word of God being thus identified—that Sixth Article, which I need not quote at length, declares that "in the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." The titles of the books are specified: thus these books together constitute the one book which the Church calls "the Bible," and I may now say of this book, we have all avowed our belief that there never was any doubt in the Church of its authority. It is evident that if any clergyman of the Church of Ireland has any doubt as to this authority, he is contradicting his subscription, is in opposition to the teaching of the Church, and is not a sound Churchman.

Moreover, when the authority of the Church in controversies of faith is defined in the Twentieth Article, it is as subservient to the authority of the Scripture. "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written; neither may it expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another." Thus the Bible, in the judgment of the Church of Ireland, is "God's word written," and of inherent authority, not conferred upon it by the Church, and paramount not only as a whole, but in all its parts, one equally with another, so that no interpretation should be put upon one statement that is repugnant to another, even the least. Nothing can be more definite, more absolute, more unlimited, more unmistakable as to the judgment of the Church both as to what constitutes Holy Scripture, "God's word written," and as to its authority. But this does not establish the authority of the Scripture; it only defines our position—the Church's position—in relation to it. The Church does not stamp authority on God's word; it only receives it as God's revelation to it, and recognises its authority accordingly. It would be the very height of absurdity to conceive that the Church, for whose instruction God commanded all Holy Scripture to be written, could impart authority to those Scriptures. Nay, it would be worse than absurd, it would be blasphemous for any creature to assert that God's utterances carry with

them only the authority which that creature may please to assign them.

Now, what do the Scriptures say of themselves? How do the prophets present them to us? How did our Lord and His Apostles deal with them? What authority did they recognise in Old Testament Scripture? If there be one portion more than another made at the present day the object of attack, as unreliable—"unhistorical," as I have before remarked, is the polite word, which being interpreted is "untrue,"

—it is the Pentateuch. Modern science, we are gravely informed, demonstrates that the record of creation is only a legendary myth. But did our Lord so regard the Pentateuch, even in any of its parts? No unbiassed man can read His references to, and quotations from, what He calls, on one occasion, "the book of Moses," without being convinced that He dealt with that book as containing true history—yea, more, as being written in the words of God Himself. Not to dwell on the fact that it is to the writings of Moses He refers when, attributing to the Sadducees their error as to the resurrection, He calls these writings "the Scriptures," saying, "ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures,"—not to dwell now on the significance of this fact, of which more hereafter, let me specify an instance, about which there can be no misconception, as to how our Lord estimated the record of the creation. To the Pharisees who interrogated Him as to the putting away of a wife, He replied, "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh?" (Matthew xix. 4, 5). Who is the Speaker in this passage, as thus quoted? Who said a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife? It was God, the Creator. In the record in Genesis the words are the words of Adam, on his wife being presented to him. Our Lord thus stamps with divine sanction the history as true, and, as written, the words of God Himself. And yet I have been flippantly told that the story of the marriage of our first parents is a myth. Wiser in their own estimation are these men than He who is the wisdom of God!

Following his divine Master, St. Paul (assuming him to be the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews), quoting from an earlier portion of Genesis, deals with it as the writing of God. Thus we read, "God rested on the seventh day from all His work." This is quoted in Hebrews as follows, "He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all His works." *He* spake—who? The "*He*" here can only be God, according to the context. Thus the earliest portion of the Book of Genesis is established to be God's own writing by His hand upon Moses.

Besides, as has been constantly remarked, our Lord's frequent reference to this portion of the Book—to the Law—is most significant. Nothing could more stamp it with authority. In His conflict with Satan, His quotations from Deuteronomy have a peculiar bearing on the authority of the Pentateuch. Three small injunctions are quoted by Him, when sorely pressed by His adversary, which enjoin certain conduct on all Jehovah's servants. He, the Lord's Servant, recognises their authority as binding upon Himself, and virtually replies to the temptations, "Satan, these precepts of God's Word I must obey, and therefore I will not yield to you." Now when we turn to Deuteronomy, we find these quotations

were the words of Moses, in his recall to the memories of the Israelites of God's dealings with them. They were not like others which had been spoken by God, and then repeated by Moses. Yet, permanently preserved in writing among His people, our Lord bows to their authority by His thrice-repeated, "It is written;" and, so written, their authority could not be questioned. But, more, He quotes verbatim from the LXX., thus teaching us that a translation which fully represents the original possesses as much authority as the original; it is "God's Word written."

Take another instance. The Sadducees, who denied the resurrection and a future life, proposed to our Lord the well-known difficulty of the woman who had married seven brothers in succession. First He replied, "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures," and then He singled out a passage from the Book of Exodus as establishing, beyond all cavil, the truth of truths, a future life in connection with the resurrection of the dead. In St. Matthew we read, "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" In Mark it is, "Have ye not read in the book of Moses?"—and in Luke, "That the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." It is worthy of note, that here the Pentateuch is called "the Book of Moses," thus vouched for by our Lord as of authority; and the words spoken by Jehovah, when written in the Book, are treated as the words of Moses—"Moses showed when he calleth;" the words of God spoken, and the words of Scripture are thus considered identical. And the words of Moses written are the words of God; and the words which God spake to Moses are, when written in the Book, to be read as spoken to the people for all time. For thus our Lord quotes, "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God?" So that whatever authority God's Word spoken possesses, the same belongs to God's Word written.

Is not this what is taught in our Lord's pregnant saying, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for He wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe My *words*?" (John v. 46, 47). Does not our Lord here put the writings of Moses on a par with, if not even higher than, His own words? In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus He puts them, if possible, still higher, as carrying with them authority to command belief greater than that of the mightiest miracle God can work. He says, "They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them. . . . If they believe not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." For his unbelief of Moses and the Prophets the rich man "in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments."

Can it fail to strike the most cursory reader of the Gospels, how entirely subordinate to the Scriptures in His conduct and teaching was our Lord, from the time that He said, "Think not I am come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," with a warning annexed against breaking, or causing men to break "one of these least commandments"—from this time until, even in His dying anguish, jealous for the Word, the written Word, the least statement of that Word, "Knowing that all things

were accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst!" In all His teaching He rested on the Scriptures, their accuracy, their truthfulness, their authority; always appealing to them in vindication of His doctrine, even making a word the point, and the important point, of His instruction,—as when He repels the charge of blasphemy hurled at Him by the Jews. "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came, *and the Scripture cannot be broken*, say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the *Son of God?*" (John x. 34-36). There is something very remarkable in the term "law," here and elsewhere in St. John's Gospel, applied to the whole O. T. (the quotation is from Psalm lxxiii. 6). What is law? Is it not the expression of the mind, the will of the lawgiver, and as such demanding implicit obedience? And in thus designating the O. T., our Lord declares that from first to last it is the expression of the will of Jehovah, bringing with it the authority of law, calling on men to "tremble at His word," and to yield it the full homage of their hearts?

A few quotations of His other references to the Scriptures will strengthen the case, showing that though He, of all men, and He alone, could authoritatively speak of Himself independently of all that was written, yet we do not find Him ever so doing: "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled" is frequently on His lips, in His appeal to authority. What He understood by the Scriptures we have already seen in His enumeration of "the Law and the Prophets," or "Moses and the Prophets." We have also "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms." This is in strict accord with what David asserts of his own utterances, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was in my tongue." Of these Scriptures the Lord thus speaks, "All things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished." "It is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." The disciples walking to Emmaus He rebuked in these words, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken. And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." "All things," He says, "must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me."

Similarly we find the Apostles ever bowing to the Scriptures, and acknowledging them to be the word of God, with all the authority of God. Thus St. Peter (Acts i. 16), "This Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake." And justifying action on the part of the Church he says, "It is written in the Book of Psalms." On the day of Pentecost he quotes freely from the Scriptures in exposition of their (his and his brother Apostles') proceedings and teaching. Similarly St. Paul referred all his teaching to the Scriptures; nothing without the Scriptures, never doubting for one moment that they were of all authority; "Paul reasoned out of the Scriptures," "believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets," "saying none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come to pass." In the council of Jerusalem, "the words of the Prophets" silenced all disputation, and justified the decree that was passed.

The proceedings of this Synod require more than a passing reference. After much disputation, St. Peter announced the conversion of the Gentiles by his agency: "my mouth" is his word. Barnabas and Paul give an account of their missionary tour, and its success. Whereupon St. James, the presiding bishop, proceeded to deliver his opinion. "Simeon hath declared how God at the first (rather, for the first time) did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name." *A people for His name*—this is the point of his summary of Peter's address. He then goes on to show that this is in strict accord with the Scriptures: "To this agree the words of the Prophets." He selects an instance from a minor Prophet: "As it is written, After this I will return, and build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and *all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called*" (Acts xv. 13-17; Amos ix. 11).

In this prophecy there is only what I must call a hint of the greatest revolution in the Church which has, or perhaps ever could, take place, even the transference of the witnesship for God—"the kingdom of God,"—from the nation of Israel to an election from the Gentiles. By two expressive metaphors, the overthrow of the tabernacle of David, and its re-erection, the Lord reveals the casting away of Israel, and the receiving of them again. On that people He had conferred the high privilege of bearing His name, and of thus being His witnesses to the other nations of the earth. But this privilege they forfeited, because that by them the name of God was blasphemed among the Gentiles. Then did He take out, and is still taking out, from the Gentiles an election on whom He puts His name, and whom He thus honours to be His witnesses during the time that the tabernacle of David lies prostrate. To this election is the reference in the prophecy, "All the Gentiles on whom my name is called." Now the authority of this obscure passage, recognised at once by the Synod as the voice of God, for the Holy Ghost "spake by the Prophets," compelled the enactment of the decree, and led to the statement in the letter which accompanied its promulgation—"it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost." What a basis on which to erect so mighty a superstructure! To this prediction, a mere hint, we owe our Christian freedom from the hard-to-be-borne yoke of the law.

The manner in which at times the Scriptures were quoted by the writers of the New Testament shows how they regarded them, not as the words of men, but as the words of God Himself, as I have already pointed out; but even at the expense of a little repetition I desire to strengthen my position by a reference or two. We have therefore such expressions as these, "the Holy Ghost saith,"—"He," God, "said." St. Peter's declaration includeth the entire Scripture: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." It is no wonder, under these circumstances, that "It is written," quoting from any part of the Scriptures, should be considered sufficient to silence all opposition, and establish any doctrine, because of the authority which necessarily attaches to the utterances of God.

This subject may be regarded as, if not identical with, Inspiration, yet overlapping it to a large extent. This leads to the consideration of St. Paul's claim for the truth of his teaching and its authority. In 1 Corinthians he asserts that by express revelation to himself God had instructed him in the deep things of

His wisdom, which no human heart could conceive. "God," he says, "hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit." Not content with this, knowing, as he must have done, the errability of human nature, and the almost certainty that inaccuracy of expression (that fruitful source of many erroneous opinions) might dim the fulness and clearness of the revelation, he adds, "Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth"—the very words taught him by the Holy Ghost. How are we to understand this?

An incorrect view of the power of Inspiration is frequently entertained. It is thought to be a permanent endowment, so that, always in operation, no error whatever could at any time be committed in expression. This is the infallibility claimed by the Bishop of Rome. Whereas the Scriptures present the power as only at times exercised by the Holy Ghost upon men. "Men borne onwards by the Holy Ghost spake from God;" borne onwards as a ship impelled by a mighty wind. This is the expressive simile of the Apostle Peter (2 Epistle i. 21). Thus Balaam, while he desired to curse, was impelled and compelled to bless, as the unhappy prophet himself admitted, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more." Again, "All that the Lord speaketh, that I must do." While under the impelling influences of the Holy Spirit, the prophet "could not do either good or bad of his own mind." Are we then to understand that St. Paul was under this mighty power every time he either spoke or wrote the truth? It is not necessary, as all he informs us of is that the Holy Ghost not only revealed to him the hidden things of God's wisdom, but also the words in which he was to teach them. And, as an honest man, to go no higher, he always employed the *ipsissima verba* which he had been taught, and no doubt his own mind fully endorsed these words as those in which, and only those he could fully, and without error, teach. His teaching, then, comes to us with all the authority of God, requiring from us implicit credence and obedience, as if we heard the voice of the Lord our God speaking to us out of heaven. Indeed, he himself notes this in 1 Thessalonians ii. 13, when he writes, "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God."

What is true of the writings of St. Paul must be true also of the other writings of the Bible. They are the utterances of God Himself. Hence they are designated by the suggestive word λόγια θεοῦ, *the oracles of God*. Oracles were divine utterances. "What advantage hath the Jew?" asked St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. His answer is, "Chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God" (iii. 2). In the oracles were included all O. T. Scriptures in his day, and now all N. T. Scriptures. The divine authority of these oracles is at the base of St. Peter's injunction. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God" (1 Epis. iv. 11). Speak as these oracles speak, teach as these oracles teach in the Pentateuch, in the Psalms, in the Prophets, in the Scriptures of the New Testament. No other oracles or writings to be the authority with "the man of God." To sit in judgment on these oracles is to sit in judgment on God, whose oracles they are.

From Genesis to the Revelation, the Bible is one

Book; its Author one, though many amanuenses' Its subject too is one, even Jesus Christ; "they are they which testify of Me," is His own testimony. He stands out in bold relief on its sacred pages: all other subjects are but the background of the glorious work chiselled by the hands of the divine Sculptor Himself—the Architect of the universe, and the Redeemer of men—all being designed to throw Him out, and present Him to the faith of men. The Book bears testimony to its own authorship, even of God the Holy Ghost. Again and again is He declared to be the Speaker. Besides passages already adduced to this effect, I must specify one more, because of its importance. In the last chapter of the Acts we read that St. Paul closed his conference with the Jews in Rome with these words, "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias unto our fathers." It is this, that it is the Word of God, "God's Word written," which gives its authority to Scripture; authority absolute, unquestionable. Nothing more childish could be uttered than to say the Word of God receives its authority from the Church. The Scriptures were written for the Church's hearing. Think of a Son giving authority to his father's will; a servant, to his master's command! How simply ludicrous! The Church may bear testimony to the authorship, the authenticity and genuineness of the books of the Bible, and, for that matter, so may an enemy, a pagan, a heretic; but neither the friends nor the foes of the faith can give authority to the contents of the Bible. Of these we can say, they come to us, every part thereof, accredited with "Thus saith the Lord." When men speak of the Church in this connexion, they have some scarcely defined idea of the Church as an abstraction. They seem to forget that the Church is we, and that we are the Church. For the Church is a corporate body with perpetual existence, though its constituents are continually changing. Do those who so speak mean that it is we who give this authority? And yet their words imply as much. If we, the Church, give this authority, we, the Church, may withdraw what we give, and take all their authority from the oracles of God. Are men prepared for this?

In conclusion, the principle for which I contend throughout these pages, and I close with the words, is that enunciated by our Lord, when He said, "The Scripture cannot be broken."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MARRIAGES OF AFFINITY.

SIR,—Mr. Cole says that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is forbidden neither by the statute law nor by the Church of England. I refer him to the cases of "Hill v. Good" and "Regina v. Chadwick," "which," said Lord Campbell, "are solemn decisions that such a marriage was illegal." And he will find that in the case "Brook v. Brook," Lords Campbell, Cranworth, St. Léonards, and Wensleydale pronounced such a marriage unlawful and void because declared by statute to be forbidden by God's law, whilst the case of "Ray v. Sherwood" shows that it is forbidden by the Church's law.

Mr. Gurney says that the obligation to hear the Church extends only to the three creeds. Any one

who will read Matthew xviii. 18, will see that it extends much farther. Pressed with the ruling of the Church on this subject, Mr. Gurney "begs me to remember that precisely the same amount of authority and the same antiquity, and no more, can be alleged for secondary worship, or the direct invocation of departed saints and angels." Now we all know that up to the fifteenth century there is no instance of these marriages being allowed, and that they are never mentioned except to be condemned, whereas the invocation of saints and angels was, Mr. Gurney alleges, allowed from early times.

I open almost the first book that comes to hand—"Bishop Harold Brown on the Thirty-nine Articles"—and there read, with regard to such invocations, "Nothing of the kind was permitted or endured during the first four centuries," and to prove this he quotes Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Athenasius, the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 364), and Epiphanius. In the fifth century he cites Chrysostom and Augustine to the same effect, whilst one of the canons of the Council of Frankfort (A. D. 749) forbids in express terms "the invocation of saints."

It is weary work arguing with disputants like Mr. Cole, who are uninformed as to the most notorious facts, or with Mr. Gurney, who produces facts of his own, home-made, and warranted to fit.

Your correspondent "Truth" grounds one of his arguments on the supposed fact that a man may marry "a deceased wife's half-sister's mother." He is in error; such a marriage is unlawful, as he may learn from consulting Bishop Gibson's Codex, or Hamnick's "Law of Marriages." The latter says (p. 43), "relationship of the half-blood is of the same effect as relationship of the whole blood."

"Truth" thinks that the fact that you may marry a wife's brother's widow creates a difficulty in the way of the Church's view. But when he has mastered the fundamental rule, *Affinitas non parit affinitatem* (Ferraris *sub v.*), "Affinity does not create affinity," his difficulty will disappear. The affinity between a man and his wife does not create affinity with the wife's *affines* but only with her *consanguinii*.

He asks me whether brother and sister are not "one flesh." I answer, Certainly not. The phrase is used in the Bible either of man and wife, or as in 1 Cor. vi. 16, *i.e.*, where there is sexual union. St. Paul calls the Jews "his flesh," *i.e.*, his relations; but he uses no such phrase with respect to them as "one flesh."

I said, "no soul ever imagined a wife's sister to be one flesh with the husband." To confute me your correspondent produces the following answer from the *Marriage Law Defence Union*, "Inasmuch as by marriage man and wife are made one flesh, the wife's sister becomes as his own sister to the man." It seems that your correspondent can see no difference between becoming a sister, and becoming *as* a sister! However a verse in this week's Gospel should make the matter clear to him: "Every one that is perfect shall be as his Master."

I do not understand for what purpose your correspondent appeals to Solomon's 700 wives. I do not suppose that he advocates Mormonism, and am at a loss to see what other cause they help. To my mind the surest way to "create infidels by the score," is to speak of the sins of eminent Scripture characters as if they were not sins. The king, is in express terms, forbidden in Deut. xvii. 17, to "multiply wives." And it has been remarked (by, I think, Coleridge), that it is one proof of the rigid truthfulness and honesty of the

Jewish historian that he does not conceal or slur over this sin of their *Grand Monarque*.

In order to prove that a cousin is "nigh of kin" as respects marriage, your correspondent refers to the use of the phrase in Leviticus xxv. 48, containing regulations respecting redemption from bondage. And having there found that "brethren, uncles, cousins, or any nigh of kin" may redeem the bondman, he jumps to two conclusions—1st, that a cousin is "nigh of kin," whereas, although of kin, it is plain that he may be (for this purpose) no nearer than "brethren," *i.e.*, any relation at all; and 2ndly, supposing him to be "nigh of kin" for the purpose of redemption from slavery, that does not in the least prove him to be "nigh of kin" for the purpose of marriage. Laban applies the same term to Jacob as Cain does to Abel—viz., brother—but the sense is different. (I remark in passing that "Truth" is in error in saying that the phrase "near of kin" occurs only in these two places. It occurs also in Leviticus xvi. 2.)

But let us go back to Leviticus xviii. which every writer that I have ever heard of up to the time of this present agitation has pronounced to be the foundation of our marriage code (Dr. McCaul, the most learned opponent of the law, admitted this). "Near of kin," or "flesh of thy flesh," are prohibited ("Remainder of thy flesh" is—as Dr. Pusey taught us—grounded on a false etymology). The following verses tell us who are "near of kin," enumerating several persons all of whom are within the third degree either of affinity or consanguinity, and making no difference whatever between these relationships. By this general rule a wife's sister, being within those degrees, is prohibited.

Further, the union is forbidden by the specific prohibition in verse 16; for if it be unlawful for a woman to marry two brothers, it must be equally unlawful for a man to marry two sisters.

This latter is of course no argument for Mahometans or Mormonites, or those who look upon marriage as only a civil contract; but it ought to be conclusive to those who believe in Him who (Mark x. 2) pronounced that what was adultery in woman was equally adultery in man, and who receive St. Paul's teaching (1 Corinthians vii. 1-4) proclaiming an absolute equality between man and woman as regards marriage, even at the very time he was insisting on the inequality of the sexes in other respects.

FREDERICK HOCKIN.

Phillack Rectory, 30th June, 1884.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—Will your readers kindly make the following corrections in what I have written in your issue of July 5th?

In the first column of page 9, line 21, omit *for*.

In the same column, in the sixth line from the bottom, for *nine or ten* read *nine*, and so in the second column of the same page.

In same page and same column, line 3, after *εὐφορεῖν* insert "in the sense of bringing forth plentifully."

Same column, same page, line 8, for "causal, to cause to sit up," read "transitive to set up."

In lines 15 and 16 omit *or seven*. This spoils the "we are seven" later in the letter, unless the loss can be supplied in some way.

In page 10, first column, line 12, for *Philemon* read *Colossians*.
ERIGENA.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

SIR,—“Clericus,” writing in the *Pulpit* of June 14th, speaks of the Hadenic or Waking system of burial, which he says has been carried on at the London Necropolis, Surrey. For the benefit of those readers who, like myself, reside at a distance, will you or some of your correspondents please to state particulars of this system? Is “Waking” a misprint for “Woking?” Does the system necessitate coffins of basket work? and, if so, how have the owners of the Necropolis managed to overcome the prejudice against any change whatever in funeral arrangements?

AN IRISH READER.

MR. REICHEL, Fellow of All Soul's College, Oxford, and son of the Very Rev. the Dean of Clonmacnois, has been nominated by the Crown Principal of the North Wales College to be established in Bangor. The Welsh people are expressing dissatisfaction that the appointment has not been given to a native of the Principality. We heartily congratulate the learned Dean on the honour done to his son.

THE following subjects have been provisionally arranged by the subjects committee for discussion at the Carlisle Church Congress, which begins on the 30th of September:—

1. The report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, with special reference to legislation.
2. Music as an aid to worship and work.
3. Parochial Missions—(1) preparation for the Mission; (2) conduct of the Mission; (3) sequel to the Mission.
4. Foreign chaplaincies—their Episcopal supervision and the relation of American and English congregations.
5. Rights of parishioners in parish churches.
6. What can England learn from Scotland and Ireland in religious matters?
7. England's religious duties towards Egypt.
8. Duty of the Church with regard to the overcrowded dwellings of the poor—(1) in towns, (2) in the country.
9. Popular literature with reference to infidelity and public morality.
10. The best means of raising the standard of social purity amongst (1) the wealthier and more educated, (2) the poorer and less educated.
11. The influence of the Reformation upon England, with special reference to the work and writings of John Wiclif.
12. The religious side of elementary education—(1) Church schools; (2) board schools.
13. Lay ministration—(1) in churches, (2) in other buildings, (3) in the parish generally.
14. Foreign Missions—(1) Missionary societies; (2) Special Missions; (3) Mission boards.
15. Results of recent historical and topographical research upon the Old and New Testament Scriptures.
16. The duty of the Christian teacher with regard to national politics.
17. The advantages of an Established Church.
18. Some aids to holiness—(1) Study of the lives of holy men and women; (2) Active self-denying charity; (3) Worship, and Holy Communion.

THE LEGALITY OF CREMATION.—On June 19th, in the Queen's Bench Division, the court for the con-

sideration of Crown cases reserved had before it an important case for decision. The appeal was against a ruling of Mr. Justice Hawkins at the Leeds assizes, that it was illegal to cremate a body when the coroner had determined to hold an inquest upon it. The contention on the part of the Crown was that to prevent a coroner from carrying out a judicial act was an indictable misdemeanor. This was disputed by the defendant's counsel, who argued that the alleged offence was not specified in the statute, that in fact it was unknown to the common law; and, further, that in order to constitute an inquest a judicial act it must be shown that the death was due to violence. We are glad to find that the judges were unanimous in confirming the conviction. It would be a most unfortunate thing if the dictates of common sense were overruled by some legal technicality. The functions of a coroner are clearly to find out whether a death was violent or not. The only preliminary condition he has to comply with is that from information supplied to him he shall see reasonable cause for instituting an inquiry, the very object of which is to establish the facts of the case. In the present instance two women, mother and daughter, burnt the body of the illegitimate child of the latter, in the full knowledge that it was intended to hold an inquest upon it. It was not charged against them that the death was caused by violence, but it was proved in evidence that it occurred somewhat suddenly. As Mr. Justice Grove remarked, “It persons having possession of a dead body upon which there were reasonable grounds for the coroner to hold an inquest were to be at liberty to destroy it, and so prevent the inquest, the consequences would be most formidable, and it might tend to give impunity to murder.” The point has yet to be determined whether the burning of a body on which the coroner decided to hold an inquest subsequent to the cremation having taken place is illegal or not. Cremation in itself is not an offence in the eyes of the law, but it must not be practised so as to constitute a nuisance, nor in order to interfere with the course of justice. The present case gives emphasis to what we have frequently expressed as a fatal objection to the proposed institution of cremation as a regular and recognised form of the disposal of the dead—viz., that it would put a premium on crime by destroying the evidence on which alone, perhaps, a conviction could be obtained. —*Lancet*.

ITALY AND ARBITRATION.—“The Progress of International Arbitration in Italy” is the title of a pamphlet of interest, from the pen of a distinguished Italian barrister, M. Norza, who took a prominent part in connection with the Conference on International Law held in Milan last autumn. The object of it is to show how much has been done by the kingdom of Italy to promote the principle of Arbitration, and a very honourable record it is. M. Norza begins with a very kind and complimentary reference to the services rendered by Mr. Henry Richard, M.P., to this question, specifying especially the two papers read by him at Cologne in 1881, and at Milan in 1883, and since published as a pamphlet under the title of “The Recent Progress of International Arbitration.” He then proceeds to enumerate the various ways in which Italy and the Italians have contributed to the recognition and establishment of this principle. He commences with the illustrious name of Count Sclopis, who was president of the memorable Tribunal at Geneva, and who, in that capacity, did so much honour to himself and his country by the manner in

which he discharged the duties of the august position to which he was called. He then pays a well-merited tribute to the faithful and eloquent and persevering efforts of Signor Mancini in the same direction. So early as 1856 the Kingdom of Sardinia, starting from the recommendation given in the Protocol of the Great Powers, made that year in Paris, entered into a treaty of friendship and liberty of commerce and navigation with the Republic of Chili, in which there was an arbitral clause, and if the arbitrators failed to agree, the decision, final and without appeal, was to be confided to the Government of some friendly nation. In 1861 a similar treaty was formed between the Kingdom of Italy and the Republic of Venezuela, with the following provision:—"In order to avoid the great calamity of war, the contracting parties agree that if anything should unhappily arise to compromise their relations of mutual friendship, they shall not have recourse to the sinister use of arms without first submitting the question in dispute to the judgment of a friendly and neutral nation, whose decision shall be held obligatory in regard to it." In 1863 a treaty to the same effect, and with the same provision, was made with the Republic of Costa Rica; in 1868, with the Kingdom of Siam; in 1871, with the Empire of Burmah. In 1873 a new impulse of a most important character was given to the cause of Arbitration by the memorable motion carried in the Chamber of Deputies by Signor Mancini, on the 24th November in that year, pledging the Chamber to the propriety of inserting an arbitral clause in all future conventions between Italy and other civilised nations. In 1878 a treaty of commerce with France was negotiated in which such a clause was not inserted. Signor Mancini immediately called attention to the omission, and proposed and carried another resolution to the effect that as the Government were about to negotiate, or renew, treaties of commerce and navigation with other countries, an arbitral clause should be inserted in all such treaties, or a special arbitral protocol be appended to those which had been already concluded. Happily, soon after, Signor Mancini, having become Foreign Minister, was placed in a position to give effect to his own resolutions, which he has done with the utmost care. Among the treaties which he has negotiated since he has been in office, in which the Arbitration clause has been inserted, have been those with Greece, with Roumania, with the Republic of Uruguay, with Montenegro, with Great Britain, with the United States of Colombia, with the Republic of San Domingo, with Switzerland, etc.

THE Rev. William Wright, M.A., has been presented by the President and Fellows of St. John's College, Oxford, to the living of Sutton, Sandy, Bedfordshire. Mr. Wright was for many years senior curate of St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington, under the late Archdeacon Sinclair, with whom he took an active part in bringing about the erection of the new parish church.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ball, Rev. Frederick Joseph, M.A., Rector of East Mersea, alias East Mersey, Essex.
 Barne, Rev. H., Incumbent of St. James's Memorial Chapel, Clifton.
 Bridgman, Rev. A. J., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Islington; Vicar of St. James's, Bath.
 Bryan-Brown, Rev. Willoughby, Rector of Amberley, near Stroud.

Carr-Glyn, Hon. and Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of Kensington, Middlesex, and Hon. Chaplain to Her Majesty; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.
 Cayley, Rev. Reginald Arthur, M.A., Rector of Ashchurch.
 Crozier, Rev. J. A., M.A., Vicar of Weston, Chester; Rector of Mundesley, Norfolk.
 Gem, Rev. Hubert Arnold, M.A., Assistant-Chaplain of the Embassy Church at Paris; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Wicker, Sheffield.
 Hicks, Rev. E. L., M.A., Rector of Fenny Compton; Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.
 Hutchinson, Rev. C. B., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and one of the Masters in Rugby School; Vicar of Naekington, near Canterbury, and Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.
 Jennings, Rev. Harnett Ellison, Vicar of St. Clement's, East Dulwich.
 Knight, Rev. J. Sabine, Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Kempston, Bedford.
 Lewis, Rev. Canon, Rector of Dolgelly; Dean of Bangor.
 Mooyart, Rev. Richard James, M.A., Rector of East Shefford, Berks.
 Peile, Rev. Arthur Lewis Babington, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, and Hon. chaplain to Her Majesty; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.
 Parr, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Marlborough; Prebendary of Shipton, in Salisbury Cathedral.
 Partridge, Rev. F., Vicar of St. Clether, Cornwall.
 Jones, Rev. John Arthur Price, M.A., Vicar of Hilton.
 Pryce, Rev. John, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bangor, and Rector of Trefdraeth, Anglescy; Canon Residentiary of Bangor Cathedral.
 Richardson, Rev. John Linsdall, M.A., Vicar of Cratfield, Suffolk.
 Roe, Rev. Henry, Rector of Poyntington; Assistant Inspector of Schools in Religious Knowledge for the Archdeaconry of Taunton.
 Sanders, Rev. Frederick Arthur, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Brixton, Devonshire.
 Sanders, Rev. W. S., M.A., Oxon, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gosport; Rector of St. Nicholas', Guildford.
 Sarjant, Rev. Samuel C., Curate of Chesterfield; Vicar of Christ Church, Burbage, near Hartington, Derby.
 Sparrow, Rev. William J., Vicar of Garnston-with-Eaton, near East Retford.
 Sutherly, Rev. William Stanley, M.A., Vicar of Lodsworth, Sussex.
 Walford, Rev. O. S., Curate of Alverstoke; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gosport.
 Wheeler, Rev. R. F., Vicar of Whitley; Rural Dean of Tyne-mouth.
 Wright, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Sutton, Sandy, Bedfordshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Coney, Rev. Thomas Boucher, for forty-five years Vicar of the parish, and Hon. Canon of Bristol Cathedral, at Pucklechurch, on the 4th inst., in his 85th year.
 Dodd, Rev. Henry Philip, M.A., Vicar, at Bosley Vicarage, Congleton, Cheshire, at the 1st inst., aged 57.
 Fisher, Rev. Frederick, M.A., late Vicar of Fleet, near Weymouth, at 2, Gordon Place, Weymouth, on the 2nd inst., aged 60.
 Glover, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight, at Bourton Vicarage, Dorset, on the 5th inst.
 Goodhart, Rev. Edward Skelton, Vicar of Owersby, at Osgodby, Lincolnshire, on the 28th ult., aged 52.
 Prosser, Rev. W., sometime Vicar of Ashby Folville, Leicestershire, at Beeby Rectory, Leicester, on the 28th ult., aged 84.
 Pryor, Rev. John Eade, M.A., late Rector of Bennington, Stevenage, Herts, at 17, Avenue Road, Regent's Park, on the 5th inst., aged 48.
 Wightwick, Rev. Henry, at Codford Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 74.
 Wreford, Rev. John, eldest son of Samuel Wreford, of Broughton House, near Sevenoaks, Kent, at Bognor, on the 6th inst.
 Wright, Rev. Thomas Booth, M.A., formerly Rector of that place, at Broughton Rectory, Brigg, Lincolnshire, on the 5th inst., aged 68.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SOWER.

BY THE REV. HENRY FOOTMAN, M.A., VICAR
OF NOCTON, LINCOLN.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY
OF CAMBRIDGE.

"Behold a sower went forth to sow."—MATTHEW
xiii. 3.

PLACED here but for one short hour to try to be a teacher in a place which I have never entered before, save as a willing and grateful learner, it has seemed to me that it may not be thought impertinent if I try to call your attention to the opening words and to one or two striking characteristics of our Lord's first Parable. They are so suggestive, as it seems to me, not only of the manner but also of the method of so large a portion of His whole teaching throughout His ministry on earth, and they are further so prophetic, as I hope we shall see, of the dealings of the model preacher with the hearts and consciences of men in every age, that, even in this place, they may afford food for thought.

"Behold!" This arousing and arresting summons to turn to external nature, and to human dealings of the humbler sort, would surely be significant, for all who are trying to teach the things of God, even if it stood alone, and if it were an introduction to a Parable which, in this respect, was an exception to rather than an instance of the preacher's usual method of address. But this appeal to the mystery and to the meaning of the usual in external nature and to the significance of the common place in man's dealings with that nature, does not stand alone, but is, on the contrary, a summons which is a frequent and striking, although a sadly neglected characteristic of almost all our Lord's Parables, and of a very great deal of His whole method of instruction, so far as we have a record of it in the New Testament.

There is not one (*e.g.*) of the seven Parables in this thirteenth chapter of St. Matthew—not one of the precious pearls in these homely settings, which does not bear me out in this assertion. The Parable of the wheat and tares;—the trading of the merchant man;—the woman at her household stuff;—the fisherman at his net;—the little grain of mustard seed, the proverbial type, for such it was in those days, of things too tiny to be even noticed by the busy or the grand; these all bear out, I say, my statement, as would others had we time to cite. And they should all be read over

Vol. XVIII.—No. 447.

carefully, once at least now and then for the purpose of engraving on the mind this characteristic, on which at the outset I feel it right to dwell. In fact, careful reading of these parables with this thought for the while predominant would prove a healthy exercise for many of us, laymen and priests alike! We should rise from such a reading impressed, not only with the simplicity of our Lord's teaching, and with its calm, grave, suggestive style—so free, as a great French sceptic has observed—from rhetorical exaggeration or strained hyperbole;—but impressed, too, as well, with what Paley aptly calls, "His choice of subjects," with the frequency with which He takes us, for light and life, to the ordinary operations of nature, and to the homelier ways of men.

My brethren, in the present condition of the relations which exist between the physicist and the theologian, the philosopher and the priest—I think it is very useful for us preachers to have our attention called to this characteristic of our Lord's teaching, which I have thus described. I think His constant appeals to external nature, in "her habit as she is," the care which He seems to have taken all through His ministry to call the attention of His hearers to the regular silent processes and operations of the forces of nature so far as they were known to the men of His day and generation—is a method of teaching which ought to encourage and guide any man who finds himself called upon to minister to the spiritual needs of men in a time when so much more is known of the forces of nature than was known then: in a time, then, when we may fairly assume that had our Lord been preaching in it He would have called our attention with equal emphasis to all that is known of nature now. Whatever we do, do not let the students of nature think we are jealous of them, or that we are disappointed when they announce the discovery of laws where men once thought there were only prodigies or caprice. I do not think that men who worship in the shrine of nature are so likely to give us trouble as the worshippers in the temple of Mammon or as the devotees of a fashionable frivolity.

No doubt the study of nature is a very absorbing pursuit, and every absorbing pursuit is beset with dangers in which a man risks his soul if he is not put upon his guard. The student of nature is like the artist or the politician or the lawyer in this respect, and he ought to be warned of it—wisely and respectfully—by the preacher, from time to time. He ought to be told that he is apt to look at the universe through the medium of this pursuit, and that he is tempted to insist that all problems of life and manners can be stated accurately and solved correctly only when they are reduced to the terms of his science. He ought to be told that he sometimes gets so absorbed, so enchanted, that he is in danger of investing the forces of nature with fictitious personality and a fictitious omnipotence,

and that all this may happen even when he is using the word "nature," as men did in Locke's time, for they know not what, and as that to which when men ascribe things "they are at the end of their wits."

But still I think we ought to be very careful not to scold, but, on the contrary, to encourage, by grateful appreciation and with wise foresight, the High Priests of Nature, who may be, if they will, the ministers of God as well.

I venture to think that our tone should be—"Behold, and fear not!" The discovery of laws is not the negation of God. Open the book of nature wider and wider, and deliver to us a plain unvarnished tale of what you find written there. Behold! He teaches us (it is the very essence of His teaching) that His witness is found not only in the gaps but in the continuity of being. "The regular, the silent, the continuous, may be as portentous to us as the deviating, the loud, or the abrupt."

And as we preachers gain this wide yet plain and practical idea of nature, an idea which excludes at once idolatry and neglect, from looking at her through the illuminating medium of our Lord's Parables of nature; so, too, I think, there are very helpful lessons to be learnt from the thought of the frequency with which He calls us, in those Parables, away from the strange, the startling, in human history, and bids us note the common round, the daily task of tradesman, agriculturist, fisherman, or peasant, and the primal simple relations of the family or of the humblest household. On those many lessons I have no time now to dwell—but this much at least I may say, that surely, my brethren, nothing which He has thus consecrated can be treated as common or unclean; or as too secular for notice in the pulpit or the prayer. We may think of this when we hear complaints of preachers, such as some pulpit purists are disposed to make, because we sometimes are guilty of introducing "secular" topics or homely allusions into sermons delivered in the house of God. We claim not only all nature, but all human ways, the common, the usual, the homely most of all, as ours of right, since the Model Preacher has taken possession of them thus. We claim them in the name of Him who is not only the Head over all things to the Church—but who binds together all creation from the highest to the lowest—from the mightiest to the meanest form—of Him who has made all things double one against another, one thing establishing the good of another, that there might be no end to the holy joy of beholding His glory thereby. Baskets of silver containing fruits of gold these parables would certainly be, if they did no more than help us to avoid all foolish depreciation, not only of nature, but of that Humanity which He has taken into the Divine—and which He has claimed as His own—of that Humanity we need not worship, seeing that we worship

the Son of Man—of that Humanity which we dare not defile now, or degrade, or despise, seeing that The Man is on the Throne of the universe, high above all the earth, and far exalted above all gods—not only of ancient mythology, but of modern polytheism—Gods of the Market, of the Tribe, of the Cave, or of the Theatre.

II. Now we may venture to "behold" with the mind's eye, to look, in obedience to the Divine summons, at *the Sower* going forth to sow.

"Behold, a sower, or *the sower*, went forth to sow." You all know the earthly story. Nothing can be simpler, nothing less ornate. There is in it nothing of the glare of the startling, the sudden, or the strange. A sower going forth to sow was a common sight enough in the land of Galilee; the varied results of such a sowing would be obvious enough to those of our Lord's congregation who could look around them, as they stood there on the shore, upon the very fields which He thus took as His text. A common sight enough, I say, not only there, but here. And yet a sight which you should stop, sometimes, that you may notice, a sight through which a Christian, though no poet or no philosopher, may have preached to him a sermon which he will not easily forget. A man (a common prosaic man may be, but that does not destroy the parable's instructiveness, as those who have followed thus far our train of thought can see at once), a man holding in his hand the germs of life, of that life before the mystery of which, even in its lower forms, philosophy is puzzled, or proffers, through the lips of one of the most distinguished of her sons, some splendid guess, which only carries us one step further into the unknown. "Behold" a man holding in his hand those seeds, one of which, if a thoughtful Christian, in thoughtful mood, will take it in his hand and think steadily for but ten minutes of the strange possibilities of development and multiplication of which it is the envelope,—one of which, I say, will fill him with that wonder, born of the knowledge that he does not know, which should drive him to his knees—"Behold" a man just scattering these right and left around him, confiding them to the mother earth from whence they sprung, in hope that the seeming loss may prove a real gain, and that what he parts with will return to him, not as it left him, but multiplied indefinitely. Behold! a man just assuming that the soil beneath him will offend against the reason of the case, and belie its nature, and prove itself unworthy of his care, if after this it lay bare and fruitless; and if after this its ascertained capacities do not in their exercise send forth upon the surface that which shall contain the germ of still richer harvests in the years to come! All commonplace enough! Nor is there anything of what the vulgar call the wonderful in what follows, as the story goes—as it goes on to tell of the subsequent discovery of the issue of this husbandry. This discovery was, you all remember, that although

there was success enough to justify the venture which the sower made, yet there were certain seeds, in themselves as really capable, as they left his hand, of reproductiveness as any of the others which he scattered in the spring, certain seeds, I say (alas, too many!), which, through the nature of the soil on which they fell, were, for his purpose, either lost at once, or, through their meeting with adverse and baneful influence, never more than *promised*, never held out unto the reaping time, and so which mocked his toil, and his free-handed costly confidence.

That is all. But what if, touched with the rays of Christ's own teaching, we are led to see that, in these dealings of man with earth and with its products, we have not merely an arbitrary simile selected at haphazard, but a true picture, a miniature, yet correct, of the dealings of the Lord of the whole earth with you and me. What, if there be a real analogy, not a mere fanciful resemblance, between the underground process of the earth in dealing with the seed which man has cast into its bosom, and the subtle dealings of human hearts and wills, whose springs are deep down indeed, with that seed of eternal life which Christ has cast therein. What if here, as has been well said, "the earth be but the shadow of heaven, and of heaven's law, and things therein each to each other like, more than on earth is thought."

III. *The sower going forth to sow.* When we spoke of Christ and His Incarnation, of Christ and of His working through His Spirit in men's hearts, we answered, so to speak, by anticipation, the anxious, and for all teachers the fundamental question—"and this Sower, Who is He?" Arguing from another parable, alike in many essential features to this, arguing too from the known facts of all the subsequent as well as of all the previous history of God's dealings with mankind—the Sower, beyond all doubt is *the Son of Man*, even that same Word of God who, all the ages through, has been the Light which lighteth every man who has come into the world, before His Incarnation or since. He it is who came forth from the Father, and entered through His Incarnation the field of our human nature, that therein He might cast the seed of life indeed, and pour His Spirit there, where, but for this, there must have been barrenness from end to end, an utter spiritual sterility, a waste and a chaos of all souls more than enough to make the angels weep. Yes! The Sower is the Son of Man, the Word of God, source of all life for men.

His field too has been, and is, *the world*, the wide human world, on which He has earned the right to tread without permission from its potentates. *The world* has been, and is, His field of operations—that world of *men*, I mean, through which His unseen presence breathes a hope. Yes, brethren, He is ever busy here, sowing seed amongst us; bearing as He does, in whispers of His word, in

the expressive silence of His Sacraments, in divers tones, now courting, now commanding, the message of Reconciliation to our hearts. Indeed, we may hear, if we only try, the music of His Gospel, and the awakening accents of His Divine appeals, at every turn, for His is still a living voice, and a living, although often an unrecognised, influence and power. He is the Sower who went forth (oh, from what a home to what an agony!) with what a costly seed! Miracle of Mercy!—Miracle of Munificence! But He is also the Sower who is ever going forth, and ever in contact with all consciences. For surely if His field is the world, then while the world lasts, from generation to generation, His seed-time and His harvest can never cease. Ever thus is the Invisible One addressing us, ever thus is the Spirit speaking to our spirit, seeking to find a habitation, yearning for a welcome there, where He would set up a throne, and introduce the legislation of the Only Wise.

The sower I say is the *Son of Man*. I want to fasten this thought firmly first. You know, that as a general rule, the preacher takes up, at once, the teaching of the parable, by which it becomes applicable to himself as teacher and to his hearers as the taught. He sows; they receive, some in this way, some in that; some so as to give him scarce a ray of hope; some so as to tantalise with just a promise which early disappoints; some to put forth leaves and flowers of spiritual vitality which fall and fade and leave no fruit behind; some to hold on to the last with patience and ripen for the calm autumn of the holy end.

My brethren, I don't want to rob you of any good which appeals and applications such as these may have done you in the past. God strengthen in you the memory of them more and more, or of any profit you may find in them for the future. If any such appeals have touched your consciences at any time, thank God for them and keep hold—tight hold upon the truth they brought to light. If any such application shall, in the future, stir your souls, do not let the soul sink back again into the supineness from which they thus, by God's mercy have been aroused. He must be a hard man (*e.g.*) whom that sermon of Robertson's, of Brighton, in which this parable is treated thus—does not touch and stir, at some point or other of his spiritual sensibility. But, while I say this, I think it will be better in the long run (even for the preacher's end), if at first we keep the attention fixed upon the Prince of Preachers. At any rate, do not let us begin by narrowing the range of the Parable, as if there were no other voices through which the word could reach our parishioners, than those we listen to (or try to listen to) in Church, or which come to them through the words and visits of the clergymen.

I hope, indeed, that the great Sower is with us now, as we try to speak to you of Him; and with

you, too, who are trying to listen or to bear. I believe, indeed, that He has given me seed to sow, which I shall become a castaway if I do not do my utmost to scatter broadcast with unabated energy, until He tells me, in accents unmistakeable, that my work is done.

All this, indeed, I can and must believe and hope, or I could not go on! To what a mockery, less sufferable than a badly acted drama on the stage, would my preaching be reduced, to what a wasted hour your time of listening, if this were not really so.

But then, my brethren, this belief need not rob us of the truth, that He who is sowing is the Son of Man. This hope need not rob us of the consolation (oh, how could any man dare to take a parish if he had it not?) that Jesus is ever going forth to sow, not only in church, but in every corner of His earth where there exists the soil of human hearts—hearts which but for this sower would never be touched by the voice or moulded by the hand of His subordinates. This faith need not rob us of the consolation of the further faith that God may do without us, as well as with us, wonders for His name; and that His Spirit is speaking through a hundred channels of which we little dream, working in men mightily, in regions deep within the soul and out of our sight at present, and in ways far more efficacious than those which the skill of preachers can devise. The field—His field—I do not doubt is the world, not merely some corner of it, where your voice or mine can reach. I know men say they hear nothing, see no lips moving, but it does not follow that there is no voice. For see you not, as in dreams (to quote old Plutarch whom our children know) there may be distinct communications and yet no articulate speech? There may be, not merely the word of mouth, and the word of the mind, to which last men refer when they describe what they call saying things to themselves when their lips nevertheless are still,—there may be not only these, but the Inner Word of mind to the inner mind, as well. And I believe that that word there is, stifled with passion and by the whirl of outward things, as the traffic in a noisy street may drown the uttered exhortation of a human voice in some great church in town, but yet there, encountering, confronting, accosting men,—coming in some wonderful manner to the recognition within, coming and refusing to go, coming and sowing seeds, haunting men in mercy, in silence eloquent as the still night to the Psalmist of the 19th Psalm. It is the sower, I am sure! What else mean those thoughts of God—those self-accusations, that dread, that half-born hope, that distrust of themselves—those questionings of the conscience which one meets with often in the case of men who have not been to church for years, of men on weary sick-beds, or of the women whom we put down as lost beyond repair? Do not these cases remind us that the sower has been there before us? It is,

sir, said once a brother of such an one to me, on such a sick-bed and in such a plight,—it is, sir, the working of the Spirit, is it not? Just so! The sowing of the sower, the echo of His footsteps going forth to sow. Yes! How are they to hear, one may often say, without a preacher?—we preachers often do say it, when we think, in towns, for instance, of the tens of thousands committed to our charge with whom neither publicly nor privately can we ever hope to speak. But surely, too, haste as we may, and as we ought, for mercy's sake to preach or to send a preacher, we may answer ourselves sometimes, as St. Paul answered the same question once by his own passionate adversative, "But I say, have they not heard?" Nay, is there not a never-failing continuance of the testimony? The stately march of the divine procession, has it not been a never-failing one? Like the firmament in that psalm which the apostle proceeds to quote, has not Jesus ever had a language, although not always to be classed with the dialects of earth? Nay, rather, hath not the divine Bridegroom gone forth from His chamber? Is He not ever going forth? And who is there of woman born, amongst us, who is utterly hid from the heat of His rays. Take the wings of the morning, and remain in the uttermost parts of the sea, He is there sowing beside all waters. Places there are here on earth, good and holy ground, where Paradise seems replanted: climb to them, He is there! Other places there are, too, where you cannot go down without a policeman, and into which even if you were sent for, you feel as if it may be only for some foul purpose and not for a pastoral interview, which so shock us and are so revolting that we call them hells on earth—I say, if you go down into those hells, He is there also.

My friends, do not let us make light of this, do not say that all this is a convenient pulpit platitude, a mere periphrasis which only means when translated into reasonable language that every man has a conscience, and that even in the lower depths of social and spiritual degradation the sinner is followed by recollections or haunted by presentiments which dog his footsteps, and follow him into the darkest corners, with the accents or indictments of expostulating shame. I deny that the bare statement that every man has a conscience, or even that every baptised man has an intensified conscience, is an explanation of the strange facts of moral and spiritual experience to which I have referred. The statement, that in these cases the sower is going forth to sow is a real explanation of these facts—nay, is a scientific, accurate statement, a statement side by side with which the proposition that every man has a conscience is loose and superficial, or at least provisional. Did you ever meet with a definition of the conscience, did you ever hear claims made on behalf of the supremacy of the conscience which satisfied you, or which made

it clear that in claiming the supremacy the claimants were not overlooking, for the nonce, some inconvenient facts respecting the liability even of conscience, left to itself, to become an unfit and unfaithful guide for man? I never did. I never met with any merely moral statements of this kind which did not lie open to this objection—an objection urged in substance, and with great force, by the late Dr. Whewell in his reverent and appreciative account of the great Butler's statement on this head. The fact is that no definition of the conscience, no doctrine of the supremacy of conscience, can be maintained against all comers, unless you go out of morals and seek help from the despised theologian. You must bring in the thought of the Mover of the conscience, of the Son of Man going forth to sow, or you involve yourself in utter inability to account for the action of the organ, as well as in the terrible danger of reducing all moral internal transactions to the level of a dialogue between two parts of a man's self; and so, in the last resort, of making a man—the individual man—a measure of all things!—nay, of making each man practically his own God! This is my profound conviction. I may be but a poor theologian, but I know enough of man, and I know enough of God, to feel compelled to state this solemnly. Here as elsewhere we may fold our hands, and bow the head and echo, each one for himself, the solemn statement of the late Canon Kingsley—"I cannot—cannot live without the Man Christ Jesus!" I am utterly at sea, dear friends, I have no word for you and no seed to sow unless the Son of Man is sower and His field the world.

Do not rob the preacher of the consolation, do no rob yourself of the awe, which this great doctrine should inspire. Do not rob me of the consolation. Oh! I want the consolation of being able to believe that the sower has been here before me, that He will remain with you when we part, to expose, maybe, my blunders, but yet by that very exposure to fulfil my hope, converting stammering platitudes even, if such they be, into truths effectual for your inmost life! Remain, O Lord, to sow!

There is consolation in the thought, but there is also awe! The thought of the nearness of the Son of Man to each of us makes every man's life a very awful thing; makes it so awful that men are glad to put it from them, and to take refuge in some less tremendous theology; awe, surely, there is in the thought that you and I, and all about us, are the subjects of a secret process, through which (for joy or for our condemnation) Christ and His Eternal Spirit are brought into constant contact with our hearts and wills—that they are the soil over which He is seeking to gain dominion, that He may reclaim them from their native barrenness. Oh! surely, if it be true, as I once heard a preacher say, that man's anomalous and fallen condition is

made manifest in the fact that he is unable, often to distinguish between the temptations which come to him from his own mind and those which come to him from the devil. If that fact fills with awe, surely the fact to which I now allude should fill us with a holy dread and a wise humility. Christ, the very Word, is near us, is speaking to us, dwelling in us, and walking in us, as Ignatius has it—and yet we know it not; we respond not; we bring forth so little fruit unto perfection. And why? Such costly care; such generous munificence; such untiring love; such splendid Husbandry, and yet so little in the life which corresponds.

Why? Perhaps the mischief is in the soil.

ON Monday the Bishop of Southwell admitted Mr. Arthur Charles, Q.C., as Chancellor of the diocese.

ON Sunday, the 13th inst., the Rev. Frederick Gurney, who had been appointed vicar of Prestbury in succession to the Rev. J. Baghot De-la-Bere, deprived, read himself in and preached at the two services, which were largely attended. No change was made in the ritual. Mr. De-la-Bere has been licensed by the Bishop of Chichester to assist Mr. Wagner, at Brighton.

THE *Pull Mall Gazette* says that the Crown has offered the vicarage of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, to the Rev. Charles John Ridgeway, incumbent of St. Paul's, Edinburgh. Mr. Ridgeway was a contemporary of Canon Boyd Carpenter at Cambridge, and is a good preacher. He was till 1880 rector of Buckhurst Hill, Essex, and an inspector of schools in the diocese of St. Albans.

ON Sunday, the 13th inst., the Bishop of Manchester, who preached at St. Andrew's, Holborn, from St. Luke v. 1, said that a panic seemed to have upset some sections of the community. They thought the people were pressing upon the hitherto privileged classes, and that all the institutions of the country were going down before the rush. Wise words were spoken in the House of Lords the other night by the Archbishop of Canterbury when he said, "Trust the people; give them their proper rights as citizens, and have confidence that they will not abuse them." The late Duke of Albany wisely said at Liverpool, "Society will move on both faster and safer if all move on together." A few nights ago, at the Health Exhibition, he saw a gathering of ten thousand people, of all classes who could afford a shilling; it was impossible they could be better behaved; there was no rudeness, no drunkenness; and among them he met eighteen or twenty old women from Kensington Workhouse, sent there by some kind friend. On the same night, at the East-end, ten thousand men and women gave the heartiest welcome to the Prince and Princess of Wales. Those grasps of the hand that were reported to have been given him would be remembered as touches of sympathy between those who were at the base and those who were at the apex of the social pyramid. In our Church reform as well as in our State reform—and the Church needed reform as urgently as the State—we must have more of the people. It was the suicidal folly of the old Sanhedrim that they despised alike the popular ignorance which they had caused, and the popular aspirations with which they had no sympathy.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1884.

THE BISHOPS AND THE REVOLUTION.

THE Bishops have begun to migrate into the chamber of the *Tiers Etat*. In the House of Lords, twelve of their graces or their lordships voted for immediate submission to the democratic movement, and unconditional acceptance of an incomplete measure, which, without redistribution, is much more of a *disfranchising* than of an *enfranchising* Bill; while only one declared in favour of exercising that suspensive veto, which is all that, in practice, remains to the Upper Chamber. The rest abstained from voting, waiting upon Providence, or, in Transatlantic phrase, watching which way the cat would jump. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the debate which preceded the division, delivered himself of that well-worn clap trap, "Trust the people," as though that was the point in question. A finer specimen of *ignoratio elenchi*, whether designedly or undesignedly, was never uttered. And the Bishop of Manchester, who did not speak in the House, where he would have met his equals and superiors in debate, and have got in return as good as he gave, reserved, with that keen sense of the fitness of things and places for which he is so distinguished, his political remarks for his next Sunday's sermon, and retailed and echoed the Archbishop's platitude in the pulpit of St. Andrew's, Holborn. No doubt these two prelates, like other ecclesiastics elsewhere, look upon the question as one of policy, and desire to win, for their hierarchy, the favour of our future masters by timely offerings of judicious flattery. Does not Bishop Fraser see that adulation is equally base, whether addressed to a populace or to a king? And can he think that such a phrase as "Trust the people" is a sufficient argument for hurrying on an immense organic change and displacement of the centre of political gravity, like that which is impending? Doubtless, the advance of democracy is inevitable, as a stage in the development of nations, which may be hastened or retarded, but cannot be averted. The statesman's art is to restrain, to mitigate, to moderate, to guide the inevitable change; to abstain carefully from exciting popular passion, from dividing into two camps of political party the nation that should act

as one. From the beginning of the Midlothian campaign to the present hour, every possible effort has been made by the demagogue who rules us to exasperate party feeling to the utmost. At no single moment of his life, has he ever risen to the position of Prime Minister of England; he has been always that of the Liberal party only. And he is engaged at present in an attempt to secure his own personal ascendancy by exciting party spirit as before. He puts words into his opponent's mouth, and then vilifies him for using them! Yet Ritualistic Churchmen and Dissenting ministers tell us that he is the most honest and most religious man of the day, that he goes to church every day, and "reads the lessons" on Sundays! This reminds us of the Tory answer to Sidney Smith's complaint, in 1811, that Perceval was ruining the country, "Oh! but he has ten children whom he takes to church with him every Sabbath-day." A baser effort than Mr. Gladstone's could not be imagined, nor one which the Bishops of a Christian Church should more carefully abstain from aiding. Their place is to mitigate the passions of the people, and not to pander to them. Even on the ground of policy, it is a very doubtful step for a clergy to coquet with revolution. Serious consequences have followed those who adopted that line in former times. Those who, in 1789, made common cause with the Revolution, had to see the hierarchy fall, and the religion follow, and the Goddess of Reason enthroned on the altar where they had ministered; many of their own heads fell by the guillotine, and the survivors had to seek refuge in foreign lands. We remember seeing in the sacristy of Notre-Dame the joint of a human backbone, encased in a setting of gold and glass, which once belonged to Monseigneur Afre, Archbishop of Paris. It was the one on which the shot took effect, which struck him when retiring from a barricade, where, in 1848, he had been making the noble but fruitless effort to persuade the insurrectionists to peace. In that case the priests had at first taken the revolution under their patronage, had descended into the streets to bless trees of liberty, and had fallen into ecstasies of delight when these brave Parisians helped them and their *viaticum* over the barricades. Flattery of the populace led gradually to that complete alienation of the artisans from church and religion which exists now in Paris, and of which the massacre at Montmartre, in 1871, was the most signal fruit. Poor Pio Nono, who ended life as the most complete reactionist, began his career as the Liberal Pope of the Revolution, blessing the banners of the Italian volunteers, and urging on the movement of which he himself was to be the victim. The fact is, that in all revolutionary movements there comes a point where priests can no longer follow without ceasing to be themselves. When that point is reached, they find themselves constrained to stop short and withdraw, and that withdrawal brings on

them more hatred than their former compliance procured for them popularity. Now we have no apprehensions of Archbishop Benson suffering the fate of his two favourite predecessors, Becket and Laud; nor is it likely that any future sexton of the Old Church at Manchester will have the proud task of exhibiting one of Bishop Fraser's *vertebræ* as that of a martyr. Revolutions in England are made with rosewater; and it is institutions, not individuals, that incur personal danger. We doubt very much whether the line which some of the Bishops have taken, and more are meditating, is really the interest either of the hierarchy or of religion. The working classes are shrewd enough to know the meaning and motive of flattery. They swallow it and enjoy it, but we doubt whether they are at all the more disposed to listen to and accept a religion which shows itself bent on securing their favour and support. Religion and its teachers should present themselves to those whom they wish to influence as from a higher and calmer sphere, perfectly disinterested, seeking nothing, giving all.

We have had occasion to notice what we esteem a grave fault in the Bishop of Manchester, and we should not like to close our article without expressing the deep respect which we, nevertheless, entertain for him. We believe him to be a thoroughly honest man, and we have before this heartily praised his action against the coarse fetish worship which has troubled his diocese like all others in the Church of England. But he is too fond of the stump. A man who has a seat in the House of Lords has a voice in the ablest and most dignified assembly in the world. Surely he might speak there like the statesman which he is capable of being, instead of reserving his political addresses for the pulpit, where there is no one to answer him, and which was made for a different and higher purpose. Thus, he has the House of Lords for politics, and a few hundred pulpits for religious addresses. Let him render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's.

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES."

A PAPER BY THE REV. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A.,
VICAR OF PENWORTHAM.

OF the many archæological discoveries that have been made in our time, none equals in importance the relic of ancient Christianity which has recently been published by Philotheus Bryennius, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, entitled the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles." It appears to be generally accepted, by those most competent to form an opinion, as a genuine document of the first half of the second century, and therefore as (what it purports to be) a form of Christian teaching actually in use among the Christians of the generation [which immediately succeeded that dim

period in the history of Christianity extending from the fall of Jerusalem to the close of the first century, which is sometimes called the sub-apostolic age. During those thirty years (A.D. 70-100), of which the whole history has perished, there may possibly have been one Apostle surviving, in extreme old age. But, undoubtedly, the leading positions in the scattered churches had already passed into the hands of men who had not seen Jesus Christ.

After this, not more than another generation of thirty years had elapsed, before the date is reached which experts assign to the writing now before us (A.D. 120-150).

It was evidently widely current in the early Church, and was treated as a document of great authority. A large part of it has been embodied in his work by that very early writer who published an Epistle in the name of Barnabas. Bryennius indeed tacitly assumes that the Apostle Barnabas is the author of the Epistle that bears his name, and, therefore, that the writer of the Doctrine is the borrower; but probably every one, who carefully compares the two writings, and remarks that, in the Doctrine, the subjects follow in a natural sequence of ideas, while in the pseudo-Barnabas the presentation of them is fragmentary and confused, will see that the latter is the copyist, and therefore that the Doctrine is older than the Epistle. In the Shepherd of Hermas, an acquaintance is betrayed with at least one passage which occurs in the Doctrine. In this case, too, the latter work seems to be the original; but both authors may have quoted from some still earlier writing, and thus be actual contemporaries. It is mentioned with respect by Clement of Alexandria, by Athanasius, by Eusebius, and, among Occidentals, by Rufinus. It furnishes the whole subject-matter of the 7th book of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions (*Ἀποστολικαὶ διατάγαι*); which book is a mere repetition of it, amplified with scriptural quotations, and interpolated with the ideas and practices which had grown up in the Christian Church between, the second century and the fourth. It is also repeated in a book of uncertain age, called "The Epitome of the Definitions of the Holy Apostles."

It was discovered in the same Jerusalem MS. from which fragments of Clement of Rome had already been extracted; and the discovery suggests the hope that there may still lurk in the recesses of Oriental libraries writings which may fill up that blank in the history of Christianity which isolates the Apostolic from all following ages.

The discoverer is a man of transparent honesty, who, although a prelate, has no idea of colouring or arranging facts to subserve a theological or ecclesiastical object. He is familiar with, and appreciates highly, the methods and results of Western criticism; and the industry which he has employed upon his subject could not easily be surpassed.

The book, as has been already said, purports to be nothing less than the course of Christian doctrine, in which a catechumen of the first half of the second century was instructed previous to his baptism. It is, in fact, precisely what the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 1) calls "the word of the beginning of Christ" (*λόγος τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ*). The first six chapters were actually to be recited to the catechumen before the rite was administered to him.

To these is subjoined a short instruction respecting religious practices—baptism, fasting, prayer, and the thanksgiving—(*ἡ Εὐχαριστία*). There follows a descrip-

tion of the officials of the Church, their titles, election, and treatment; and the work concludes with the views prevailing among these early Christians about the Lord's second coming and the resurrection.

From this we learn that the course of instruction preparatory to baptism contained absolutely no theology whatever. It consisted entirely of morality of that highest kind which we have learnt from our Bibles to call holiness. The catechumen was told that there were two ways, one of life and one of death. The way of life was founded on the two great moral commandments, and consisted itself of self-sacrificing love, justice, and purity. The way of death was in all points the opposite. These principles are applied in the Doctrine to some of the circumstances of actual life as it then existed; but not a word is added on matters that we should call doctrinal. The whole book does not contain a single theological term, or the slightest vestige of a dogma.

Baptism, we learn, was administered with the same formula which we ourselves have derived from St. Matthew's Gospel. Spring water (*ὕδωρ ζῶν*) was used, if possible; if not, any water there might be, cold or warm. If immersion were impossible, sprinkling three times would suffice. There were no super-added ceremonies. Both baptism and baptized must fast for one or two previous days. Infant baptism is not mentioned nor provided for—perhaps was not yet known.

On the subject of fasting, which follows, we are met by one of the very few decided divergencies which the Doctrine contains from the tone and principles of that earliest Christianity of all, which is contained in the Apostolic writings of the New Testament. The hypocrites are no longer those whom the Master had denounced—those who fasted to be seen of men, but those who fasted on the second and fifth days of the week, instead of the fourth and sixth, which last were already the established Christian fast-days. Thus Christianity had already developed one external badge or shibboleth; nor, as we shall shortly see, was this quite the only one, though such were still very few.

Prayer must be made in the words which the Lord commanded in His Gospel. The Lord's Prayer, which is recited almost exactly according to Matthew's version, is to be offered three times daily. The Gospel (*εὐαγγέλιον*) thus referred to is evidently a written document, which contained at least the discourses of Christ, which now form part of the first Gospel.

Next follow instructions on the mode of offering the thanksgiving or Eucharist (*ἡ Εὐχαριστία*). This Christian rite was, when this writing was composed, in the very act of acquiring that technical distinctive name which in the Apostolic writings it does not yet possess, but which it has ever since retained. In the New Testament *Εὐχαριστία* means simply thanksgiving, and is nowhere identified with the breaking of bread. In the Doctrine the name still means thanksgiving; but it is also in process of attaching itself as a distinctive technical term to the great thanksgiving of Christians which takes place in the breaking of bread—a rite which was then losing, though it had not yet quite lost, its most ancient name. The most important of these Eucharistic instructions is the form of thanksgiving that is ordered to be used when the wine is drunk and the bread broken and eaten. We may call this the most ancient Christian Liturgy, though, in using this last word, we are guilty

of an anachronism, for the word Liturgy (*λειτουργία*) had not yet begun to mean a devotional formula. It seems well to subjoin this form of prayer entire, and to print its directions as rubrics, so that it may appear as what it is, a form—and indeed the most ancient of all Christian forms—of congregational worship.

Concerning the Thanksgiving (Εὐχαριστία) give thanks (εὐχαριστήσατε), thus—

*For the Cup:**

WE THANK THEE,† OUR FATHER, for the holy vine of David Thy servant‡ which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant:§ to Thee be glory for ever.

Concerning the Breaking (περὶ τοῦ κλάσματος):—

WE THANK THEE, OUR FATHER, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy servant: to Thee be glory for ever. As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains, and being brought together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom: for Thine is the glory and the power for ever.

Let no one eat or drink of your Thanksgiving (Εὐχαριστία), save those who have been baptized into the name of the Lord.

After having eaten and drunk sufficiently,§ return thanks thus:

WE THANK THEE, HOLY FATHER, for Thy Holy Name which Thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge, and faith, and immortality which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant: to Thee be glory for ever.

THOU, LORD ALMIGHTY, hast created all things for Thy Name's sake; Thou hast given food and drink to mankind for enjoyment, that they may give thanks (*εὐχαριστήσωσι*) to Thee: but to us Thou hast given spiritual food, and drink, and life eternal, through Thy servant. Before all things we thank (*εὐχαριστοῦμεν*) Thee that Thou art mighty: to Thee be glory for ever.

REMEMBER, LORD, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in the love of Thee; and gather together, from the four winds, it, the sanctified one, into Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever.

LET grace come, and let this world pass away.

HOSANNA to the Son of David.

IF ANY is holy, let him come: if any is not holy, let him repent.

Maranatha. || Amen.

Permit the prophets to offer as many thanksgivings as they please (εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν).

Most remarkable is this form of devotion, both for what it contains and for what is absent from it.

* The Cup comes first, as in Luke xxii. 17.

† *εὐχαριστεῖν* is used here and elsewhere for giving thanks.

‡ The word *παῖς*, servant, is applied indiscriminately to David and to Jesus, precisely as in Acts iv. 25, 30.

§ Note.—*μετὰ τὸ ἐμπληρῶθαι*. The use of this word shows that the Thanksgiving was still part of an actual meal, for *ἐμπληρῶναι* means to satisfy the appetite, as may readily be seen by comparing the use of the word in the Greek of the New Testament, which is most nearly allied to that of the Doctrine, Luke i. 53, vi. 25; John vi. 12; Acts xiv. 17; Rom. xv. 24. The 7th Book of the Apostolic Constitutions substitutes characteristically "after the reception" (*μετὰ τὴν μεταλήψιν*). The social repast had disappeared in the interval between the second century and the fourth, and a sacrificial ceremony had been substituted for it.

|| The Lord is at hand, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 21. Renan ("Les Apôtres," p. 92) appears to be right in saying, "Le mot secret que les confrères disaient entre eux, pour se reconnaître et se fortifier, était Maran atha, 'le Seigneur va venir,'".

Instead of heaping laudatory epithets on the Deity, as we do in our Liturgies, as if He were a Byzantine emperor who required his dignity to be maintained by flattery and ceremonial, it takes our Saviour at His word, and frankly accepts His permission, when we pray, -to say Our Father. The spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father, had not yet been stifled by that priestly ceremonial which afterwards edged itself in between the Parent and His child. The worship is almost entirely thanksgiving: and the gift most fervently thanked for is knowledge—knowledge not intellectual but moral—knowledge how to love, instead of hating and being selfish, and how to keep the heart and life clean from sin. There is no mystery—no ceremonies—no priesthood—no affectation of supernatural power—no elevation or adoration of the elements—no Canon of the Mass. Fetish worship of material objects is still at home in its native heathen fanes, and is still an abomination to every Christian mind. Yet, even in the midst of this simplicity and beauty, we may detect another substitution of the ceremonial for the moral. The rubrical direction excluding the unbaptized from communion is justified by an appeal to the Lord's authority—"Give not that which is holy to the dogs" (Matthew vii. 2). Certainly the Lord did not mean the unbaptized by that word; and the second generation after Christ had receded a few degrees from the inwardness and charity of their Founder; and ceremonial lustration had begun in Christian as in heathen minds to usurp the place of moral cleansing.

Very remarkable also is it to note the germ of the idea of priest and sacrifice, which, at the time of the origin of our Doctrine, was entering, though it had not yet entered, into the Christian mind; and which betrays, by the connection in which it stands, the source whence it came. The obligation to dedicate the first-fruits to religious purposes had already been transferred from the old covenant to the new. Then the question arose, To whom must these first-fruits be paid? The answer is, To the prophets, for these are your high priests (*αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν*), and the Mosaic regulations (Numbers xviii) are quoted as if still binding. Thus the idea of priesthood came directly out of the Mosaic system, and, at the time of the origin of the Doctrine, had not yet attached itself to the presbyter-bishops of the Christian congregation. The germ of the idea of sacrifice in connection with the Thanksgiving had also appeared. The passage is interesting, and may be quoted at length (chapter xiv). "On the Lord's day, having met together, break bread and give thanks (*εὐχαριστήσατε*), having confessed your sins, that your sacrifice (*θυσία*) may be clean. Every one who has a dispute with his companion, let him not take part in your assembly, until they are reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled; for this is what was spoken by the Lord, In every place and time offer to me a clean sacrifice; for I am a great king, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations." The quotation is evidently Malachi i. 11, 14, and the use of it indicates clearly that the sacrificial idea of worship passed from Judaism into Christianity. But, at that early period, the offering was not one of material objects, such as bread and wine, still less of the body and blood of Christ, but simply one of thanks and praise, identical with that in the Hebrews—the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of the lips (Hebrews xiii. 15).

The next subject considered is that of church officials. The twelve Apostles have disappeared,

But their office of travelling missionaries, and their name descriptive of that office, is occupied by a fresh set of itinerants, called indifferently apostles, prophets, or teachers. These claim to speak on the direct inspiration of the Spirit. The right of each of them to the title which he assumes, and to reception by the churches which he visits, is not determined by any external credentials, but, as the Master had left instructions in His Gospel, by his fruits. Very curious rules are given for testing the character of the pretended apostle. The internal government of each church is still, as in the period of the Twelve themselves, administered by bishops and deacons—two orders only, each acting in plurality; nor has the most rudimentary germ of monarchical organization, either of the congregation, or of the diocese, or of the whole church, yet appeared. This disposes entirely of the theory propounded by Rothe, and modified by Lightfoot, that monarchical episcopacy, though unknown to Peter and Paul, was founded by John, and such other of the Apostles as may have survived the fall of Jerusalem, in the last thirty years of the first century. Our Doctrine shows that, in the first half of the second century, a bishop's throne no more existed than a *Cathedra Petri*, and, consequently, that monarchical episcopacy is an institution unknown to all the Apostles. The officials of the churches were elected by those churches themselves, nor did any external authority exist to interfere with that right. The distinction between clergyman and layman had not yet appeared.

We will not enter into the eschatology of the Doctrine, which, though it contains one or two phrases which are difficult to interpret, appears to have been derived from the discourses of our Lord in the Gospel of St. Matthew.

We have already mentioned that at a much later period—probably in the fourth century—this Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles was recast by a writer who introduced into it the ideas and practices which had entered into Christianity in the mean time, and republished under the name of Apostolic Constitutions (*ἀποστολικαὶ διατάξεις*). A comparison of the two documents will convince any intelligent reader of the enormous difference between the second century and the fourth, and also of the rapidity with which a popular institution like the Christian Church becomes modified and at last revolutionised by the influence of the world outside.

The Doctrine will have a very important influence in determining the true position of episcopacy. The historical basis, upon which that form of organization was once supposed to be an apostolic institution, had already crumbled to pieces. It was well known previously, that in the period covered by the writings of the New Testament, extending to about A.D. 70, bishops and presbyters were not two orders, but one, and that no trace of monarchical institutions can be found at that time either in the congregation, or in any wider district, or in the Church at large. It was also well known from the Epistle of Clement that in the next generation, and down to the close of the century (A.D. 100), the earliest form of organization continued unchanged. At this point the Doctrine comes in, and proves that the same state of things was prolonged at least one generation longer (A.D. 120-150). Then follows Justin, yet another generation later, whose Christian period may have extended from about A.D. 140 to 165, from whom we learn that the Christian congregation had in his days developed a presi-

dent (ὁ προεστώς), who recited their prayers and thanksgivings, and in whom the germ of monarchical institutions had at last appeared; but whether that president was, in Justin's days, a permanent official, or a chairman elected for the occasion, there is no evidence to show. After this come the writings of the pseudo-Ignatius, which were evidently composed at the period when the institution of episcopacy was struggling to make good its ground as the sole legitimate form of Christian organization. Thus episcopacy loses entirely its pretensions to be accepted as an Apostolic institution, and stands confessed as one of the latter half of the second century. Along with it falls the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, which, in the hands of John Henry Newman and his associates, had such momentous effects on the Church of England. According to that doctrine, the graces of the Holy Spirit, the validity of orders, the effect of sacraments, the existence of churches, all depend on the communication, by the ceremony of laying on of hands, of a spiritual *virus*, with which the Apostles inoculated the first bishops, and they their successors, generation after generation, to the present moment. But now, the connection between the first monarchical bishops and the Apostles having disappeared, the channel through which the grace was supposed to have flowed is shown never to have existed at all.

Thus the institution of episcopacy will be compelled to content itself with humbler ground than that which its holders and admirers have lately claimed for it. It was not founded by Jesus nor by His Apostles, nor, consequently, does it form a part of original and necessary Christianity. But then, the same negative may be predicated of every form of Christian organization that ever existed. Jesus Himself originated no form of organization whatever; and those which the Apostles founded were mere temporary makeshift institutions, adopted to supply momentary wants, such as alone were needed in a world which (as they all believed) was in a few years to end, and the King Himself to appear and regulate His kingdom, in which every subject was to be a priest, by His own present authority. Though episcopacy be not divine, yet it possesses a prescription of seventeen centuries, with which it may surely be content as a sanction of its more moderate claims. It stands on the same footing as royalty, which no longer claims to be divine, and it can defend itself only, yet sufficiently, on the grounds of its long existence through the providence of God, and of its usefulness to the Christian community. That community to which, and not to the officials alone, the Spirit and grace of God came, can modify, or limit, or, if it think good, abolish that or any other portion of its institutions.

The moment of the appearance of this little work is singularly opportune. We live in a period whose ecclesiastical—we will not profane a holy name by saying religious—developments have reached the acme of unreality. The highest offices in the Church of England are now distributed, according to his sole will and pleasure, by a politician who once believed in the divine right of bishops, in the sacrificial power of priests, and in a Divine presence existing in a piece of bread; who may, possibly, believe in those things still, and who certainly exercises his dictatorial powers for the support and propagation of those doctrines and those alone; yet, at the same time, exhibits himself, as a hearer and worshipper, on platforms where all such doctrines are most decidedly contradicted. In the first see of the English Church

there is an archbishop whose ideal and idol is the Middle Ages; who looks on that period as "the great old age" of Christianity, who desires to restore its organisation, its decorations, and its ceremonies, dependent as all these are on its sacerdotal pretensions and idolatrous beliefs; and who would have the original documents of Christianity interpreted authoritatively by a tradition so recent, so vague, and so varying as that embodied in the Book of Common Prayer; yet advocates freedom of inquiry, and desires to see the Reformation of the sixteenth century completed. A commission has recently sat to remodel the judicial system of a Church whose independent position is justifiable alone by the inherent right, which every Christian community possesses, of returning to the liberty of primitive Christianity. The members of that commission, profoundly impressed with the necessity of basing their recommendations on exhaustive historical inquiry, and guided by the most learned antiquarian of the age, traced their subject of Christian judicial institutions through the Middle Ages up to the Heptarchy, and, having landed it in the darkest period that could be found, left it there, thoroughly satisfied with their achievement. Nor, amidst all their inquiries and deliberations, does the idea appear to have once occurred, either to Dryasdust himself or to any of his followers, that an historical investigation of an important part of the framework of Christian government, which stops short at the end of the sixth century after Christ, and makes no reference to the principles or documents of original Christianity or to the teaching of Christ Himself, is somewhat incomplete. Meanwhile, under the united patronage of prelate and politician, decorations and ceremonies are being introduced into churches, of which the question is never asked whether they illustrate or embody truth, but merely whether they are æsthetically effective. The most prominent of these ceremonies is the worship of a piece of bread, rejected three hundred years ago, but now restored; although, neither in the priest who manipulates this fetish, nor in the elegant ladies and gentlemen who project themselves in attitudes before it, nor in the Bishop who connives at its introduction, can be traced the slightest vestige of belief in the idol which they pretend to worship. Graven images are being set up in what is again called the sanctuary of churches by persons of wealth, fashion, and distinction; and clergymen, unabashed, recite the Second Commandment in front of them, the one *haruspex* being only saved by the eastward position which he adopts from having to laugh in the face of his companion. "And this iniquity shall be to us as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant" (Is. xxx. 18).

Into an ecclesiastical world thus full of self-contradiction, honeycombed with make-believe, and therefore verging towards its fall, comes this fresh breath from early and almost primitive Christianity. We knew already from the apostolic writings, that Christianity did actually once enjoy a Golden Age, in which the Christian community aspired to the highest ideal standard of moral life, when it invited and embraced all whose ideal was identical with its own. That paradise is dead now, and buried, and forgotten, but it did once exist; and this little book proves to us, that, more than a hundred years after the final disappearance of Jesus, churches were still to be found whose members lived the old holy and truthful life, and in which there were neither priests nor pre-

lates, neither ceremonies nor theology. Is it vain to hope for a revival, in this our day, of the forgotten simplicity, sincerity, and truth of Christ? The contemporary religious world is smitten with a vague feeling of unrest, which drives it through all manner of dry places, searching in vain for truth and peace. Is it not perhaps possible that the original Christianity of Christ, carefully investigated and truthfully acknowledged, irrespective of the consequences that it may entail on existing parties or organizations, may bring with it stability, harmony, and rest for souls?

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MARRIAGES OF AFFINITY.

SIR,—“Truth” would remind Mr. Hockin that *flesh* is only “a part of the body,” while the remaining portion is the *blood*, which “circulates through the body;” therefore to master Mr. Hockin’s doctrine of “one flesh,” it will be first necessary to know whether he means flesh only or flesh and blood. Mr. Hockin repeats that “no soul ever imagined a wife’s sister to be *one flesh* with the husband,” yet he maintains that by a transubstantiation at marriage the man and wife are made “one flesh,” and that by this transubstantiation the wife’s sister becomes as his own sister to the man. Now, common sense would tell us that if the wife’s sister became as his own sister, the wife’s brother would also become as his own brother; the wife’s brother being one flesh with his wife, brings her as closely related by affinity as a deceased wife’s sister. The Prayer-book forbids marriage with a wife’s brother’s daughter; now how does Mr. Hockin take his magic line of relationship to a wife’s brother’s daughter, when her father and mother are declared by the Church to be of a remote kinship by affinity? Take Archbishop Benson’s mode of counting as explained to the House of Lords, June, 1883:—“The man himself, his wife, her brother, his wife,” four persons, the latter of whom his Grace says you may marry: now count a wife’s brother’s daughter—“The man himself, his wife, her brother, his daughter, four persons.” This daughter the Church says you may not marry. Your readers will see that, whether you adopt this way of counting or the plan of the Bishop of Lincoln, and go up to the wife’s father thus—wife’s father’s son’s wife, wife’s father’s son’s daughter, you come to the same thing—that both the “wife” and “daughter” count the same number or degree, call it third, fourth, or fifth degree. Certainly the daughter, if there is a difference, is further removed from “the man;” yet marriage with her is forbidden.

Mr. Hockin says, “‘Truth’” is in error in supposing that a man may marry a deceased wife’s half-sister’s mother.” Let Mr. Hockin look carefully over the “Table” in the Prayer-book, and see if he can find marriage with a “wife’s stepmother” forbidden. Who would a deceased wife’s half-sister’s mother be but a “wife’s stepmother.” “Truth” claims the best of this, and repeats the question, “How can a child be of different *flesh and blood* to her mother?” The so-called perfect marriage-law says the child is “near of kin” by affinity, but her mother who gave her birth is *not* “near of kin.” Should Mr. Hockin want any

other portion of the Affinity Table explained I can do so with pleasure.

Mr. Hockin *does* know why I quoted Solomon’s 700 wives, to refute his statement that Leviticus xviii. 18 forbade marriage with *two* wives. By the way, Mr. Hockin does not dispute the fact that Jehoiada, the high priest, “took for Joash two wives,” neither does Mr. Hockin say this was sin either on the part of Joash or Jehoiada. Elkanah, the father of holy Samuel—Mr. Hockin is silent respecting him also. The verse must mean what it says, “a wife to her sister,” or you make God’s word contradict itself, which in my humble opinion is worse than repeating truths of the Bible, although they reflect sinful acts of men. By the way, it was the “strange women” that Solomon married which led him away from God, not the number of his wives. I am quite aware that the law of polygamy is not suited for our times, but surely that does not prevent me from repeating what the Bible states is “written for our instruction.” There is not much “jumping at conclusions” with reference to the statement that cousins are “nigh of kin,” for both in the “redemption from bondage” (Leviticus xxv. 48-49) and the “law of inheritance” (Numbers xxvii. 8), the order of relationship is the same—brother, uncle, cousin, while in the “Tables” in the Prayer-book there are some fourteen persons with whom you may not marry, who, according to the Archbishop’s counting, stand in exactly the same degree of kinship as cousins by consanguinity. For example, you may not marry a “father’s brother’s wife,” “the man himself, his father’s brother’s wife,” four persons. A cousin would be “the man himself, his father’s brother’s daughter,”—four persons. Your readers will see that “Truth” states the truth.

The third instance of “near of kin” (Leviticus xxi. 2), which Mr. Hockin reminds me of, certainly confirms my opinion, inasmuch as no relation of affinity is counted near of kin to the priest.

TRUTH.

July 14th, 1884.

THE DIACONATE.

SIR,—I have read your leading article on this subject in your last issue; and, as far as my experience goes, I see no necessity for such. There are, as you admit, an immense number of clergy who are unattached. Why, in the name of common sense, employ them, and give them positions, in place of adding to their number, taking as it were the bread out of their mouths by advocating this new order of deacons. I am a curate, now in orders over ten years, have filled some important curacies, can furnish good testimonials, am a good preacher and reader, and some of my sermons have found a space in your valuable paper. Still, I am now one of the great army of the unattached, and cannot get a permanent position, the consequence has been, my wife has been obliged to take a house in Wales, in hopes of augmenting our scanty income, while I take, when I can get it, temporary duty. I know of one clergyman, whose wife had not long since to open a millinery establishment in Liverpool, to support her family. It is a crying evil of the Church of England, that better provision is not made for the deserving clergy, and means taken to provide for those labouring on scanty stipends, while others, who do almost nothing, have the loaves and fishes in abundance. Of course, I am not advocating the cause of those who are not worthy, but some better provision should be made for

curates, that they may not be treated quite like servants by rectors and vicars, got rid of, when it suits these, in many cases from no cause at all but jealousy. I wonder those in authority don't see these things from a curate's point of view; it makes one conclude they have forgotten the time they were in a similar position.

AN UNATTACHED CURATE.

St. Swithin's Day, 1884.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

SIR,—Allow me to state in answer to "An Irish Reader," whose letter appeared in your last issue, that the London Necropolis Company's system necessitates no change whatever in funeral arrangements. Their earth-to-earth coffin, although the principal portion of it is composed of such perishable material as pulp, still possesses the strength, solidity, and general appearance of an ordinary coffin, and, therefore, cannot possibly offend the most sensitive eye, or jar upon any conceivable prejudice.

The particulars of the earth-to-earth system cannot, I think, be better explained than is done by Mr. Seymour Haden in one of his letters to the *Times*. He says:—

"The main conditions of effective and non-effective burial are shortly these. When the body dies, putrefaction sets in at once, and, for as long as it is allowed to remain exposed to the air, continues. Two methods of excluding the air from a dead body present themselves in practice—the direct and natural method of placing it in the earth, and what may be called the evasive and unnatural method of inclosing it in a solid case or coffin. By adopting the first method, inasmuch as we both exclude the air and invoke the resolvent action of the earth, we fulfil all the conditions of effective burial. By adopting the second method we fulfil only one of these conditions, and prevent the other. In the first case resolution at once takes the place of putrefaction; in the last the condition of putrefaction is rendered permanent. In the first case, if we look for that body at the end of five or six years we shall not find it, or, rather, we shall only find the inorganic part of it—the organic, resolved into its constituent elements, having re-entered the atmosphere. In the last, if we look for it after fifty years, we shall find it as we left it—plus the action upon it of the air and of the fluids of the body which we have included with it in the coffin—that is to say, in a state of advanced but unprogressive putrefaction.

"'Waking' is a misprint for 'Woking.'"

J. LARKMAN,
Secretary.

London Necropolis Company,
2, Lancaster Place, Strand.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE SALVATION OF MANKIND BY ONLY CHRIST OUR SAVIOUR FROM SIN AND DEATH EVER-LASTING." No. III. of Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. London: The Church of England Book Society. Price 3d.

THIS sermon or homily sets forth plainly and fully the doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ

our Saviour, as taught by the ancient Fathers of the Church, and further points out that true faith produces good work whereby we show our love and gratitude for the precious benefits bestowed upon us, and leads us to render ourselves unto God wholly, with all our will, hearts, might, and power. "These be the fruit of true faith: to do good as much as lieth in us to every man, and above all things and in all things to advance the glory of God, of whom only we have our sanctification, justification, salvation, and redemption."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Blaxland, Rev. George C., Vicar of St. Andrew, Haverstock Hill.
Boyce, Rev. Wilfrid Anderdon, Curate of Shalford; Vicar of Echingswell-cum-Sydmonton.
Bradley, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Rector of Elsdon.
Cayley, Rev. Reginald Arthur, Rector of Scumpton, Lincoln; Rector of Ashchurch.
Collin, Rev. E. W., Curate of St. Mary Magdalen and St. George-the-Martyr, Oxford; Chaplain of Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.
Elrington, Rev. C. A., Curate of St. Salvador's, Dundee; Priest-in-charge of St. James's Mission, Penicuik, Midlothian.
Foster, Rev. Herbert C., Curate of All Saints', Gloucester; Rector of Preston, near Ledbury.
Gee, Rev. Canon Richard, D.D., Reader to Her Majesty, and Vicar of New Windsor; Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.
Harrison, Rev. William Graydon, Vicar of Bacton Hereford.
Hilton, Rev. Alfred Giles, M.A., Rector of Witcomb, near Gloucester; Rector of Stansfield, Suffolk.
Hughes, Rev. J. R., M.A., Curate of All Saints', Cheltenham; Rector of Greenhithe, Kent.
Joyce, Rev. Conway, Curate of Walcot, Bath; Vicar of Sydenham, Oxon.
Maddock, Rev. Henry E., Fellow of Clare, College, Cambridge; Rector of Patrington, near Hull.
Marshall, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin, Sandford, Oxon.
Newcombe, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Granborough, Bucks.
Rainey, Rev. James Bryant, M.A., Vicar of Holwell, Oxon.
Robinson, Rev. Arthur E., Curate of St. Philip's, Hulme; Sole Charge of St. Michael's, Flixton.
Sarjant, Rev. Samuel C., B.A., Curate of Chesterfield; Vicar of Christ Church, Burbage, Buxton, Derby.
Scott, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate of Giles-in-the-Fields; Vicar of St. Mary's, Paddington Green.
Smith, Rev. Arthur Langdale, Vicar of Steeple Claydon, Bucks.
Sparrow, Rev. W. J., M.A., Rector of Gamston and Vicar of Eaton, Eist Retford.
Thorndike, Rev. A. J. W., Minor Canon of Rochester Cathedral.
Wace, Rev. Henry, D.D., Principal of King's College, London; Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Collins, Rev. Robert Cave Wood, at the Grove, Hillingdon, on the 8th inst., aged 72.
Gifford, Rev. John George, B.A., on the 4th inst., aged 77.
Limoclan, Rev. Ernest M. C. de Kerven, B.A., at the Grammar School, Bishop Auckland, Durham, on the 8th inst., aged 51.
Pennington, Rev. Walter, Vicar of St. Philip's Kensington, on the 13th inst., aged 38.
Roberts, Rev. John Wynne, second son of the Vicar of Aberdaron, Carnarvonshire, at Llandudno, on the 4th inst., aged 29.
Turner, Rev. George Henry, M.A., Vicar of Tolleshunt Major, at Saltcourt, near Maldon, Essex, on the 9th inst., aged 63.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE USE OF THE SENSES IN RELIGION

BY CANON LIDDON, D.D.

PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

"Reach hither thy finger and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing."—JOHN XX. 27.

EASTER is soon gone, and as we look around us we must feel with some regret that it has been possible for us to gather only a few of its many lessons; but we may profitably revert to the second lesson for last Sunday afternoon, and to that scene in the upper chamber at Jerusalem on the eighth day after the resurrection. It will be in your recollections, my brethren, that when, on the day of His rising from the dead, our Lord first appeared to the assembled disciples, St. Thomas was absent. The disciples informed Thomas on meeting him that they had seen their risen Master, and he answered them in terms which would not have been unbecoming in an advanced disciple of the modern philosophy of experience, "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe." A week passed. The disciples were again assembled, and now Thomas was with them. And "then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and said, Peace be unto you. Then said He to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing."

Now, a first object of our Lord's words was, we may dare to say, to place the truth of His resurrection from the dead beyond doubt in the mind of St. Thomas. Probably Thomas would not have denied that something had taken place, whatever it might have been—whatever its explanation might be. We need not suppose him to imply the bad faith of the other disciples. In his apprehension, they were not deceivers, but somehow or other deceived. They were the perfectly honest victims of an inexplicable delusion. Some form, some phantom—so he probably conjectured—had passed before them; and they, in the excited state of mind which was only natural after recent occurrences, could not distinguish between the real and the apparent, between an impression produced, by whatever agency, on their minds and an object, altogether independent of them. He, for his part, was not going to yield to anything less imperative than the report of His senses. "Except I see in His hands

the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe."

Now, it would not have been inconsistent with our Lord's accustomed dealing with human minds, if he had declined to satisfy such a demand as this, for, plainly, my brethren, it was an unreasonable demand. The other disciples were not likely to be simultaneously deceived as to a matter about which they were one and all so deeply interested in ascertaining the exact truth, and their united testimony ought, in reason, to have satisfied St. Thomas. Most of the truths which we men hold and act upon we receive upon the authority of other men, and the common judgment of mankind pronounces the testimony of those whose good faith or general capacity there is no doubt about to be a sufficient attestation of a fact which may itself contradict our previous or general experience. But our Lord sees in St. Thomas the typical representative of a class of minds that would be found among men to the end of time, and for whose case He, in His abundant charity and condescension, is willing to make provision. It was more important to Thomas that he should be convinced of the truth of the resurrection than that he should first learn the unreasonableness of his motive for hesitating to believe it; and therefore our Lord meets him on his own terms. As He bade the disciples, "Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have;" as He "took a piece of broiled fish and of a honeycomb and did eat it before them," so now He deigns to go even all lengths with the demand of Thomas. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing." It was, indeed, of the first importance that the *bonâ fide* character of the resurrection of Christ should be thus placed beyond the reach of doubt, for already there were tendencies in the air which afterwards became what was called Docetism—the disposition to question the reality not only of Christ's resurrection body, but of the body which He wore before His crucifixion and on the cross. As men possessed themselves more and more with a true and exalted idea of His sacred and eternal Person, they found it increasingly difficult to believe in a condescension which had really robed that Person in a body of true flesh and blood. Such contact as this with gross matter seemed unworthy of Him who is absolute and eternal Spirit, and they accordingly endeavoured to persuade themselves that His bodily form was not substantial, that it was only a deceptive appearance, or, to use their own word, a phantasm. Now, might not such a persuasion have seemed to gain countenance from what was reported of Christ's resurrection body—of its appearance at different places without any traceable intermediate movement—of its passing, as it did, through closed doors, of its sudden vanishing from sight, as from the two disciples at

Emmaus? It was no doubt, as St. Paul says, "a spiritual body;" that is to say, it had acquired at the resurrection properties of which we have no experience in this present life; but what was the import, what were the limits, of these new properties? How far did they impair the identity of the risen body with the body that was crucified? How far was the risen body real or only apparent? These, I say, were vital questions—vital in view of the nascent tendencies of the time—vital, moreover, because they were merely different forms of the great question of all—whether the resurrection was a literal fact or not. And on this, as has been said before, all else depended—the redemptive virtue of the passion, the certainty of Christ's disclosures about the eternal world, the verification of His claim to have come from heaven and to be the Son of God manifest in the flesh; and, therefore, Thomas, though unreasonable, should be gratified; he should know by sensible pressure of his hand and finger that he had before him no unsubstantial phantom form, but the very body that was crucified, answering in each open wound to the touch of sense, whatever new properties might have also attached to it. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing."

And a second lesson to be learnt from these words of our Lord is the true value of the bodily senses in the investigation of truth. We have seen that St. Thomas made the satisfaction of two senses a preliminary condition of his believing that our Lord had really risen. The sense of sight was to be satisfied as to the existence of our Lord's wounds, which as St. Thomas may have thought, the eleven disciples in their joy and bewilderment might have neglected to look at with sufficient particularity. But Thomas will not altogether trust his eyesight. It might be imposed upon by appearances. What looked like a laceration in the hand or in the side might be, after all, only a blood-stain upon the surface; and therefore Thomas will have the verdict of the eyesight verified and corroborated by the verdict of a grosser sense—the sense of touch. His finger must be put into the print of the nails, his hand must be thrust into the riven side, before he will surrender himself to faith in the resurrection.

Now, here is a demand for what we may term an extreme form of experimental or sensible satisfaction, for, as the hearing is the most spiritual of the five senses, so the touch is the grossest and the most material; and yet our Lord, in His condescending charity, yields to this demand, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side; and be not faithless, but believing." This is, let us observe, remarkable, since it is not what an ordinary religious teacher would have been likely to do under any conceivably similar circumstances.

When an ordinary teacher of religion is confronted by demands for a sensible test or proof of any truth relating to his religion, his instinct is to say that such demands involve a mistake as to the nature of religion, and as to the sort of proofs which are to be had in connection with it. Nay, more, our Lord's own teaching had seemingly tended in a totally opposite direction to that of this concession to Thomas. Does he not seem to be constantly struggling against the exaggeration of the outward at the cost of the inward; against the Jewish craving for visible signs; against the Jewish trust in outward forms; against the disposition rooted, indeed, in all human nature, but especially developed in Jewish and Pharisaic nature, to cling to the external and to forget or to depreciate that which lies above or beyond it? The fact is that our Lord's reply to Thomas is a recognition of the rights and the duties of the senses. There are certain terms which they, and they only, can ascertain, and in verifying which they may and must be trusted. It is a false spiritualism which would cast discredit on the bodily senses acting within their own province. It is false to the constitution of nature—false to the interests of truth; for, if the bodily senses are untrustworthy, how can we assume the trustworthiness of the spiritual senses? If hearing, and eyesight, and smell, and taste, and touch, make no true reports of external objects, how shall we be certain that the moral perceptions do not report to us a series of what, after all, are only sublime illusions? To cast doubt upon the trustworthiness of a bodily sense is at first sight, to enhance the preciousness of the supersensuous, and of our methods of reaching it; but only at first sight. Religion does touch the material world at certain points, and the reality of its contact is to be decided, like all material facts, by the experiment of bodily sense. Whether our Lord really rose with His wounded body from the grave, or not, was a question to be settled by the senses of St. Thomas, and Our Lord, therefore, submitted Himself to the exacting terms which St. Thomas laid down as the conditions of faith.

And here we see how to answer the question whether at the Holy Communion the bread and wine remain *bonâ fide* bread and wine after the consecration. That is a question which must be decided by the senses of sight and taste and touch. If the senses report that the bread is still bread, and the wine is still wine, then that question is settled. True, our Lord has said of either, "This is My body," "This is My blood," and Christians, at least, will not take unworthy liberty with His language by resolving it into metaphor, or by disbelieving its strictly material force; but then how are we to reconcile the two,—the report of the senses, on the one hand, and the plain sense of the words of Christ upon the other? We answer that we do not know how to reconcile

them, just as we do not know how to reconcile the experimental fact of our individual free will and the revealed fact of the Divine sovereignty. We cannot get nearer the truth in this matter than by saying that these elements remaining in their natural substances are yet veiled channels of the Sacred Presence which is plainly, in whatever sense, identified with them by the very words of Christ. But it will not do, in order to give what we may think fuller effect to His words, to say, for instance, that the senses are deceived, that the bread is no longer bread, though it seems to be bread, for to do this, observe, is to sap one of the very bases of truth, since the same senses which report to us the continued existence of bread in the consecrated element reported the reality of the wounded hands and side of the risen Jesus. If the one report is illusory so may be the other. Nothing is gained in the long run for religion by anything which casts doubt upon the true functions of sense.

I say "upon the true functions of sense," for the bodily senses cannot test the reality of anything which lies properly beyond their ken. The senses have to do with matter; they cannot touch spirit; and, if any inference is drawn from their very limited capacity as against the reality of that vast world of spiritual existence which is confessedly beyond their reach, it is, beyond all question, a worthless inference. Here is the great mistake of materialism. Materialism is on strong ground, from which it cannot be dislodged, so long as it insists that the senses, so far as they reach, are trustworthy reporters of truth. Its mistake lies in saying that the senses are the only reporters of truth, and that nothing is to be held for truth which the bodily senses cannot verify—that the whole world of mental and spiritual facts, with which the bodily senses have no relation whatever, is therefore an imaginary and non-existent world—that, in short, matter, in whatever shape, is alone real. But this gigantic and fatal error is not for one moment to be met by discrediting the senses acting within their own province, for to do so is to invite the ravages of a scepticism which is deeper far even than that of the materialists, since it denies the reality of matter as well as of spirit, not to speak of its being clearly opposed to that high sanction of the evidence of sense which our Lord gave when he bade Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side; and be not faithless, but believing."

Now, these reflections may naturally lead us to think of the eminent man whose death during the past week is an event of European importance, and whose works have, besides producing something like a revolution in certain districts of thought, shed, confessedly, so much distinction upon English science. It may be admitted that, when Professor Darwin's books on "The Origin of Species" and "The Descent of Man" first

appeared, they were largely regarded by religious men as containing a theory which was necessarily hostile to fundamental truths of religion. A closer study has largely modified any such impression as this. It is seen that, whether the creative activity of God is manifested through "catastrophes," as the phrase goes, or in a progressive evolution, it is still and always His creative activity, and the really great questions beyond remain untouched. The evolutionary process, supposing it to exist, must have had a beginning. Who began it? It must have had material to work with. Who furnished that material? It is itself a law or a system of laws. Who enacted them? Even supposing that the theory represents absolute truth, and is not merely a provisional way of looking at things incidental to the present stage of knowledge, these great questions are just as little to be decided by physical science now as they were when Moses wrote the Pentateuch. But there are, apparently, three important gaps in the evolutionary sequence which it is well to bear in mind. There is a great gap between the highest animal instinct and the reflective, self-measuring, self-analysing thought of man. There is a greater gap between life and the most organised matter. There is the greatest gap of all between matter and nothing. At these three points, so far as we can see, the Creative Will must have intervened, otherwise than by an evolution out of existing material, to create mind, to create life, to create matter. But, beyond all question, it is our business to respect in Science, as in other things, every clearly ascertained report of the senses, for every such report represents a fact, and a fact is sacred as having its place in the temple of universal truth. Professor Darwin's greatness is not least conspicuous in the patience and care with which he observed and registered minute single facts, as well as groups of facts. Who that has read his last book on "Earth Worms" can forget the experiments by which he set himself to discover whether a worm possesses the faculty of hearing? But then a fact is one thing, while theories, hypotheses, doctrines, like that of evolution itself, framed by men of genius so as to include or to account for the facts, are quite another. These theories may or may not be true, even if they are brilliant and imposing. They may for a century or a generation carry everything before them in the world of thought; but Science tells us that it knows no finality, and, while theories pass and are forgotten, facts, like God's Revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ, remain. The bodily senses report facts. Of theories about facts the senses know nothing. It was on the report which the senses made of a fact that our Lord set His seal when He bade Thomas thrust hand and finger into His sacred wounds, and be not faithless but believing.

And we learn, thirdly and lastly, from our Lord's words how to deal with doubts of the truth of

religion, whether in ourselves or other people. We live, it is needless to say, in an age which, to a large extent, is an age of doubt. In private intercourse, in general society, in clubs, in workshops, among men of letters, among artisans, truths are freely called in question which were received unhesitatingly by our fathers, and for which they would have gladly shed their blood. Certainly doubt is not the only characteristic of our age; side by side with doubt there is faith—strong, penetrating, intelligent, definite, and in its growth and strength lies the best hope of the future. The current does not flow all one way, and yet the widespread existence of doubt in many who have been brought up as Christians is unhappily notorious. Nay, what is more serious is that the spread of doubt in religious truth is looked upon in some quarters as a positive advantage. Doubt, it is said, is the parent of inquiry; doubt is the foe of mental stagnation; doubt it is which explodes superstitions; doubt means movement, energy, progress. This may be true as regards many subjects of human interest, our information respecting which involves a mixture of truth and error. In these, doubt has its province and function. It has a stimulating, purifying, corrective influence. But every sensible man would agree that to doubt necessary truth, such as the axioms of mathematics, could lead to no mental advantage whatever, and, for Christians who believe that God has spoken, the Christian revelation is necessary truth. No man who believes revelation to be true can regard doubts about it as other than one of the very greatest of possible human misfortunes. To take any other view of doubt than this is to be already committed to its principle. When the poet says that

There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds,

he must be contrasting those who are hesitating to accept a creed which they have never held with those who have held a creed as a mere profession, without knowing its inward secret power. Otherwise his words are, assuredly, a false paradox. It is false to say that the man who doubts the truth of religion is better off in any way than the man who accepts it with his mind and heart.

Let us distinguish, my brethren, between two things that are often confounded—doubt as a habit of mind, and a specific inquiry. Inquiry into religious questions is often, and for many Christians, not merely a legitimate, but a serious duty. We cannot obey the apostolic precept of being ready to give a reason of the hope that is within us, without inquiry, often anxious and perplexing, into the grounds of that hope. But doubt, as a state of mind—doubt, as a permanent cherished habit of the soul in dealing with religious truth—is, I make bold to say, a calamity of the first order, if only because it is so fatal to moral vigour. There are some here who know that in what I am going

to say I am not describing an imaginary case. It is in a man's best moments, it is when he is making his best efforts, that the haunting spirit of doubt deals its most fatal blows. You would take refuge for half-an-hour from the pettinesses, the trivialities, the degradations of life in the pages of the New Testament, in communion with that Divine Figure whom we meet in the Gospels, and forthwith the spirit of doubt seizes on some apparent discrepancy between this evangelical narrative and that, and whispers, "May it not, after all, be but a beautiful legend?" Or you remember some such promise as, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee," and you take refuge in prayer. The living God, at any rate, you say, is here to help you; and as you begin to pour out your whole soul to Him, the spirit of doubt suggests that He to whom you are speaking is, after all, only a creation of human thought whom the highest Science has now-a-days banished from its conception of the universe. Or, recollecting the happiness of a good communion in years gone by, you again present yourself at the altar, and for a while it seems as if the old associations which gather round those moments, so tender, so awful, might victoriously assert themselves within your soul, when, lo! the Spirit of Doubt breathes into your ear, with a dreadful cynicism, his question, "What is the good of it?" and heaven's sunshine disappears from your soul, and all again is darkness.

Now, it is a matter of common sense that doubt cannot thus utterly destroy the value of the Gospels, the value of prayer, the value of communion with the Holiest, without moral loss. Ay, it shatters the very springs of moral effort. It makes barren and unfruitful those very moments of life in which moral energy should find its refreshment and its force. But why need I insist upon a truism which will find a ready echo in too many a weary heart? To talk of doubt as a gain, as an advantage, is the language either of ignorance or of insincerity. Doubt is, above all things, in the majority of cases, utter moral paralysis. It is the loss of the motives which make even this life happy by making it useful.

Our Lord's prescription for dealing with doubt may be summed up in this rule—Make the most of such truth as you still recognise, and the rest will follow. Thomas did not doubt the report of his senses. Well, then, let him make the most of that report. And a rule like this might be expected to work well because it would obviously counteract the particular habit of mind which fosters the state of doubt. Doubt flourishes in—or, rather, it *is*—a mental atmosphere of vagueness where nothing is quite denied, nothing quite accepted, where everything is thought possible, everything uncertain, where men lazily suppose that there is as much to be said against any one truth as there is to be said for it, and no one to strike the balance between the conflicting evidence. Now, if any one truth,

however limited and elementary, can be really held by a human soul as true, it will, so far, arrest this habit of universal doubt. And there are very few men who do not hold something for true, even though there should be a very stinted creed indeed. If they reject the grace of the Sacraments, they believe in the Atonement. If they deny our Lord's Divinity, they are, as the phrase goes, "Christian theists." If they cannot believe anyhow in the Christian revelation, they have no doubt that there does exist a moral and personal God. If, unhappily, they have doubts as to this great, primary, awful truth, yet they recognise in themselves the law of right and wrong—recognise it not the less clearly, though they cannot be certain what is right and what is wrong. Very well. If they have lost hold upon all besides, let them make the most of this one remaining shred of truth—the recognised distinction between right and wrong. Look hard at that distinction, my doubting friend. It is for you what the pierced hands and the riven side of Christ were for St. Thomas. It bids you thrust your hands and fingers into it, and grasp it, and convince yourself that, whatever else is uncertain, it at least is real. Look hard at it, at that distinction. Handle it well; make the most of it; and, so far as it is concerned, you are no longer a doubter. Here is a something solid before which you bow. Look hard at it, handle it, and it will lead you on, if you will only let it, to truths beyond itself: for this law of right and wrong, it is a law. It is not a fortuitous result of social prejudices. It is a law. It implies a lawgiver, and a moral lawgiver too, in order to give it. And when faith in a moral God has been recovered, here is another and infinitely grander truth limiting the province and the operation of mere doubt, and inviting the doubter to feel its immensity and its power, that it may lead him on to other certainties which depend on it. You believe in a moral God; but can He be at once almighty and moral?—can He survey this world which His hands have made, and which contradicts so much that is, upon the supposition, His essential nature, and yet have made no sign—have committed Himself to no interference, to no remedy, to no revelation, in order to alleviate the ruin and the woe? No, it is impossible. The more you grapple with the fact of the morality of God, the more clearly you must perceive the immense, the overwhelming force of the presumption that such a Being must reveal Himself to men; and, in the light of this vast antecedent presumption, the evidence that He has done so in the Christian revelation becomes more than sufficient.

So, again, if portions of the Divine revelation itself are received, while the rest is questioned, the same rule applies. You have no doubt about the Atonement. You cannot understand the grace of the Sacraments. Very well, make the most of the Atonement. Consider what it implies as to the

character of God. Weigh well the spirit and the genius of the statements of Scripture on which it rests. Ask yourselves, if you would continue to hold it, if you applied to it the destructive arguments which you used freely, maybe, against the efficacy of the Sacraments; and you will see in time that the Atonement leads you on beyond itself to a recognition of the true character of those gracious and merciful provisions whereby its benefits and graces are conveyed to the human soul to the end of time. The fact is, that no one truth is isolated altogether from other truths. There is an intercommunication between truth and truth which lies in the nature of things, and the sway and guidance of which cannot be resisted by an honest mind, so that when any one truth is really grasped as true the soul is in a fair way to recover healthiness of tone and to put an end to the miserable reign of vagueness and doubt. No sooner was St. Thomas sure that he saw before him the body of the risen Jesus than he confessed, as if a flash of light had poured in upon his soul, not merely the truth of the Resurrection, but the infinitely higher and vaster truth of Christ's true Divinity which it attested. "Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and My God."

Let none, then, who doubt despair. One single truth may save faith in all. One single truth—the last, it may be, in the order of surrender—if clung to as for life, may be the starting point of faith's resurrection in the soul. Cling to that truth, my brother; cling to it, as you would live in the true sense of life. Cling to it though there be to your present apprehension nothing else to which you can cling. Thrust hand and finger into its very wounds, that you may at least be certain of its reality; and then be assured that this faithful tenacity will in the end stand you, too, in good stead—that the dawn of a brighter day is not far off, when He, to whom most assuredly you cling in clinging to any one thing that is true, shall bring you forth to the perfect light, and your eyes shall behold His righteousness.

THE Archbishop of York has appointed the Rev. C. S. Wright, vicar of Doncaster and Canon of York, to be one of his chaplains.

THE Rev. Malcolm MacColl, who for the last thirteen years held the City living of St. Botolph, and has been in the London diocese since 1858, when he was curate of St. Mary, Soho, and was subsequently curate of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, and St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, has accepted the canonry of Ripon, vacant by the death of the Rev. H. M. Birch. In 1862 he was chaplain to the British Embassy at St. Petersburg. He has published several pamphlets on the Eastern Question, which ran through many editions, and has also written largely on it in newspapers and magazines. He is a very strong Liberal and a warm personal friend of the Prime Minister, and the *Post* says he "may be described as a moderate High Churchman with Broad Church sympathies."



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1884.

THE GRAND OLD MAN.

ON Monday last the revolutionary party opened its campaign of intimidation against the House of Lords. There was a vast multitude, generally well conducted, with much good humour and little enthusiasm ;

Pleads he in earnest ? look upon his face :
His eyes do drop no tears ; his prayers are in jest ;
His words come from his mouth ;

and in the orators there was a total absence both of eloquence and of argument. No powerful tribune made his appearance, and even Sir Wilfrid Lawson could hardly raise a joke. The popular hatred of the House of Lords did not appear to be dangerous ; so that Mr. Gladstone, if he wishes to excite popular passion to fever heat, will have to take the bellows himself, as he did in Midlothian. The real question before the country was entirely ignored. Yet the public mind cannot, we should think, be led away permanently on a false scent, but will return to the real question, which let us state again. It is simply this—Whether it is wise and right that the half of a measure should be presented and carried in ignorance of what the second half may be ; or whether both halves shall be presented at once ? Let us consider what the Lords have done in reference to this question. They, whose function in the commonwealth is to supply the break-power which mitigates the violence of popular impulses, and enforces those delays which furnish time for maturer consideration and more careful statesmanship, had placed their veto upon a measure which had passed the popular branch of the legislature, but which was confessedly incomplete. They said that they were willing to consent to an extension of the franchise as wide as was desired, but that it must be presented to them in a measure framed with statesmanlike completeness and containing a scheme of redistribution. In this they were acting undeniably within their rights, and discharging the proper functions for which a second chamber exists. Their veto was fully understood to be suspensive only ; for such only has it been for fifty years or more, when applied to a measure of the

first magnitude. For this an outcry has been raised against them, and their very existence menaced. It would be a small thing if such menaces proceeded only from petty demagogues, or were expressed in the wordy resolutions drawn up by political wirepullers and passed at party meetings. The serious matter is that the attack upon one branch of the constitution, one element in our legislature, has been originated and suggested by the responsible ministers of the Crown, with the Premier himself at their head. Many of Mr. Gladstone's utterances have been as clearly invitations to popular intimidation as Mark Anthony's speech in "Julius Cæsar." And this reminds us again, as we are reminded at every turn, both in ecclesiastics and in politics, that the great danger to the country lies in the unchecked ascendancy of one single man. Since his great rival died, one despotic will has been supreme in every department both of Church and State ; and that will is largely influenced by the various impulses and ideas which make up a very singular personal idiosyncrasy, and especially by personal interests and ambitions which he has rhetoric and dialectics sufficient to dissimulate to his party, and disguise from his own conscience, under the cloak of disinterested patriotism. When he initiated his famous attack on the Irish Church, all his talk was, of course, about truth and justice ; but it was evident to Samuel Wilberforce, his close confederate in ecclesiastical policy, that one of his chief motives was "his bitter hatred of the low tone," that is, of the absence of sacerdotal pretension which characterised that branch of the United Church. The same "bitter hatred of the low tone" is exemplified, as we have often shown, in his present distribution of Church patronage ; and it is only political motives which can be imagined to suppress that hatred, while fraternising with Dr. Parker and Mr. Spurgeon. It will not be forgotten that, when his first administration became unpopular and was threatened with collapse, he dissolved Parliament, deliberately placing the bribe of a proposed abolition of the income-tax in the forefront of his manifesto—an act worthy only of the lowest class of American politicians. That bribe was rejected by the English people, and well would it have been for them if they had always been so wise. His great rival was then placed in power, and under him the country enjoyed an exemption from party violence which perhaps it will never know again. From this repose it was awakened by the Midlothian campaign—an effort of unscrupulous demagoguery, disgraceful to the man who conceived and executed it, but infinitely more disgraceful to the country which permitted it to succeed. A politician of the first rank was not ashamed of descending into the popular arena, and there declaiming on high questions of state, and even of delicate matters of foreign policy, which should be reserved for

cabinets or conferences of high diplomats. Without a spark of generosity, he used every weapon of the tongue to overthrow the rival whom he hated as bitterly as he still hates the Protestantism of the Church of England, which his rival saw, but which he did not and does not, to be the only principle upon which a free national Church can either defend itself or be defended. Thus he regained power, and his administration has been a succession of failures, the fruits of which are almost universal anarchy. In Ireland anarchy rose to such a pitch, that most of the constitutional guarantees of liberty had to be suspended, and remain suspended still. In South Africa there is anarchy again, and, for the first time, the British power surrendered after a defeat by an inferior enemy. In Egypt and the Soudan the anarchy is even greater, and he who was ever casting in his rival's teeth the bloodshed in Bulgaria, in which Lord Beaconsfield had no concern, deliberately slaughtered around Suakim five or six thousand men, whom he himself declares to have been fighting for their liberty, in an expedition for which no motive can possibly be assigned except to restore the credit of the Gladstone administration. Thus the man who has railed most bitterly at the blood-guiltiness of others has proved himself the blood-guiltiest of all recent English ministers. An administration so unsuccessful and so mischievous was fast falling from power, and needed a new cry to enable it to go with hopes of success before the people, and therefore this unscrupulous politician set a trap for the House of Lords. And he will now, we suppose, go to the country with the cries of Enfranchise the two millions, and Destroy the independence of the House of Lords, and thus, unless the people of England have sense and wisdom to choose the better course, obtain a new lease of power for his party and himself. We hope for the best, and, in order to do our little all towards preparing the defence of the better cause, we press upon our readers, whether lay or clerical, their duty of taking part individually in the contest which is now beginning. The thing that is now urgently needed is to release the country from the ascendancy of a man who is totally unfit to rule her. The worst régime under which a country can be is a demagogic despotism, such as will have become complete if Mr. Gladstone succeeds in breaking down the resistance of the House of Lords. Such a victory would result, as he no doubt foresees, in his own absolutely unchecked and unlimited dictatorship, until the populace rises and breaks its idol, which may not occur until increasing age compels him to resign. The best and ablest man that ever lived is not fit for the position of demagogue-despot, which Mr. Gladstone is preparing for himself, by attacking the only independent force which yet exists in our commonwealth; and we think that future ages will wonder that a nation which is still great,

although, it is to be feared, far advanced in its decline, ever graved for itself so slight an idol as the Grand Old Man.

THE Prime Minister's appointment of Mr. MacColl to the Canonry of Ripon has naturally given rise to much cavil. For our own part, we see nothing unnatural in it—nothing more remarkable than an exhibition of respect for those qualities which most distinguish the Prime Minister himself.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MARRIAGES OF AFFINITY.

SIR,—An interminable controversy, such as that with Mr. Hockin threatens to be, is a wearisome matter. I have already said, and I repeat, that, in my judgment, the prohibitions of Lev. xviii. do not directly apply to marriage, save in verses 17 and 18 (the first of these distinctly applying to polygamous unions), but rather to any and all unlawful approaches to those that are near of kin. Where consanguinity is concerned, the prohibition must plainly extend, by implication, to marriage also, and, accordingly, we find the three degrees which constitute nearness of kin expressly mentioned, namely (1) parents and children, (2) brothers and sisters, and (3) uncles and nieces or aunts and nephews. But in all these cases it is unlawful connection, and not marriage, which is directly prohibited; this latter, indeed, being out of the question within the two first degrees. This is the only sense in which affinity is placed on a level with blood-relationship, as I understand the matter; not with regard to marriage, but in respect to intrigues and unlawful connections. It was to guard the purity of family life that the law was laid down in a highly disordered state of society, when there was no doubt great need for it. Some of the sins alluded to prove this distinctly.

The marriage law creates relationships for the time being which are not absolutely indelible. A husband and wife are one flesh in this sense—that they are bound to regard their mutual relations as their own; but, by universal consent, they cease to be one flesh when their union is dissolved by death. Thus the wife's sisters become the husband's sisters in a sense and for the time; he is bound to treat them as sisters, and an unlawful affection for one of them partakes of the character of incest. But it is expressly provided that, after a wife's decease, a widower may marry one who has been his sister, in the well-known words, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other, *in her lifetime*." The marginal translation, "one wife to another," seems plainly inadmissible in the face of the various distinct regulations for recognised polygamy, such as Deut. xxi., "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, &c." Again, it is expressly provided (Deut. xxi. 5—10) that if brethren dwell together, and one of them die, her husband's brother shall take her to wife. It is fully granted, of course, that a husband's brother *need* not be a very brother, but only the nearest kinsman; but it is plain that a very brother cannot be

excluded,—is rather distinctly intended in the first place. Here, then, is one marriage of affinity expressly permitted, and another expressly commanded. Surely the burden lies on those who would enforce the prohibition of such marriages to prove from any portion of Holy Scripture that affinity is indelible like blood relationship, and so, *e.g.*, that it can never be lawful to marry the sister of a deceased wife. The contrary assumption is built wholly and exclusively on the unwarranted assertion that all the prohibitions of Lev. xviii. apply to marriage, which, as we have seen, they do not and cannot, but rather to all unlawful connections whatsoever. Fearful and monstrous iniquities of various kinds are dealt with in this chapter of Leviticus, as again in chap. xx., certainly in no wise pertaining to any marriage law.

Clearly, we are not bound, as Christians, by the letter of the Jewish law. No man would contend, for instance, that adultery should now be punished with death. The extreme severity of the law was doubtless urgently required by the existing state of license and confusion. Hence all these detailed prohibitions of unlawful connections or intrigues within the family circle. These intrigues would be, and are, as grievous now as they were then, or even more grievous in Christians; only it would not be lawful or expedient to punish them by death. But I must confess that I cannot see any divine warrant for the prohibition of marriages of affinity. A wife does not necessarily mean a widow, and the special interpretation of Mr. Hockin and all those who think with him is based on the assumption that a wife, *e.g.*, "a brother's wife," must always mean a widow also, as in the prohibition, "And if a man shall take a brother's wife, it is an unclean thing." If a wife here means a widow, if what is prohibited is marriage and not intrigue, how can this passage be reconciled with the distinct command that a husband's brother shall take the wife of the dead to wife?

Is it not clear that the word "wife" may be used in different senses, and may or may not mean widow—a matter which must be judged of from the context?

To me it seems dangerous and unlawful to place an arbitrary interpretation on certain passages of the Levitical law which those passages do not really bear, and then go on to enforce them on Christian nations and communities. I have no interest in this matter, as I need scarcely say, save that of an impartial looker on, a lover of humanity, who sympathises with many sufferers, and an earnest Churchman, who is exceedingly desirous that the Church of England should not stand committed as a Church to irreconcilable warfare against the law of the whole of modern Europe, with the solitary exception to the present day of Great Britain and Ireland. It appears to me that a certain body of good men are espousing an absolutely hopeless and unhappy course under a grave error of judgment and interpretation. I fear there is little hope of convincing them as long as they continue to hold that the ties of affinity are as indelible as those of blood relationship. To me such an opinion seems wholly unreasonable, and I am compelled to vindicate my Christian liberty of judgment, and that of thousands of my fellow-subjects here and in the colonies; for where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty, though certainly not unlawful license.

ARCHER GURNEY.

SIR,—Mr. Hockin says that "he is weary with my arguments." Why does he not honestly say that he is unable to answer them? Instead of quoting the Act of Parliament or the law of the Church, by which marriage with a deceased wife's sister is made illegal, he wishes your readers to think that the facts of this question are not known to me, and quotes some law cases to prove that the marriage is unlawful. I do not dispute that bishops, clergy, judges, lawyers, and a large majority of the people have all considered the law to be against the marriage; but our opponents having done their best to prevent any change in what they say is the law, I made it my business to inquire into the laws of marriage, and the result of my researches enables me to defy Mr. Hockin to produce any "Canon" or authority of the Church of England, excepting those of 1603, all of which I dare say Mr. Hockin himself disobeys, as do most of the clergy, excepting the 99th. So with the law of the land, I defy Mr. Hockin to name any statute of England which contains the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. I repeat, the Act of 1835 contains no "prohibited degrees," refers to no tables of consanguinity or affinity; it simply forbids marriage "within the prohibited degrees," which are only those forbidden by the 32 Henry VIII. c. 38.

Take, for instance, an Act of Parliament stating that "no prohibited cattle shall land in England," would not that Act require the existence of some former Act or Acts, stating what cattle were "prohibited"? Should we take any list that some farmers' association chose to give us for our guide? I say No, especially when there were "prohibited degrees" in a former Act of Parliament.

The bishops and clergy have appealed to the "law;" I therefore ask them to produce that law. Mr. Hockin will not find the marriage with a deceased wife's sister forbidden by any unrepealed statute of the realm. I challenge him to produce it. Never mind what judges have said—the law is above them; they are supposed to administer that law; if they have given wrong judgment, so much the worse for them and their victims. Mr. Hockin has appealed unto Cæsar, and unto Cæsar he shall go.

ALFRED COLE.

Hoxton, July 15th, 1884.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—In his endeavour to make good his thesis that St. Luke derived a large number of words from some medical school of his period, "*Erigena*" is led to look at Greek, as a living spoken language, from a different point of view from myself. Allowing the patent fact that Greek medical writers made use of current ordinary Greek, he yet claims that St. Luke borrowed his expressions from them when they both apparently simply use the ordinary language at their disposal. Again, because "*Erigena*" derives his knowledge of Greek words from certain authors, he assumes that writers, to whom it was a living language, seething in their brains and rolling volubly from their tongues, positively did the same as himself and acquired their knowledge of Greek in the same way. Thus he talks of St. Luke getting his use of ἀρχαὶ from Euripides, and εὐροπεῖν from Josephus. I reject the assumption, as putting a living language on a level with a dead one. St. Luke may never have read Euripides or Josephus, and yet the words may have

been quite familiar to him. Greek, as we have it in books of the period, and Greek as it was spoken with varying vocabularies and expressions in the great commercial cities of Asia Minor, at Antioch, at Smyrna, at Ephesus, or again in Macedonia, in Illyria, at Alexandria, and elsewhere, were very different things indeed. It is like comparing a skeleton with the living body. There is no reason whatever why St. Luke should not have used any one of the 350 words elaborately dug out of medical treatises by Dr. Hobart, without having seen a single medical book in his life. I never read a medical work myself, and yet I dare say I have in my vocabulary a very much larger number of medical terms than ever St. Luke uses. When we consider, too, that out of these 350 words there are only a very few, viz., six or seven, which can be termed medical—exclusively medical they are not—“*Erigena's*” argument falls to the ground. I maintain that it is perfectly possible and extremely natural for a non-professional man to make use of medical terms which he hears in common conversation, when the occasion requires. Thus, Josephus was not a physician; but let any one turn to his description of the last fatal disease of Herod the Great (“*Antiq.*” xvii. 6, 7), and he will read what, in those days, would have passed for a medical diagnosis. May I ask “*Erigena*,” *en passant*, if he has ever thought of making a list of the words common to Josephus and medical writers. It would be fair also to make the same comparison for St. Matthew and the other two Gospels as he makes for St. Luke. St. Paul's Epistles, we know from Dean Plumptre's essay in the *Expositor*, of August, 1876, have several so-called medical words. They are enumerated by the Dean, and are found chiefly in 1 Timothy and Philipians. Had St. Paul, too, studied at a medical school, or was he influenced by the medical phraseology of St. Luke, his companion? If “*Erigena*” jumps at this last suggestion, then for one whose mouth was so running over with medical phraseology that he innoculated his friend St. Paul, I must say that his deeds were in strange contradiction to his words. Passing by the fact that St. Luke is never represented as attending a patient, much less as affecting a cure, let us turn to two occasions when, if ever, his professional skill and knowledge were absolutely needed. When wrecked in the island of Melita a viper in his presence fastens on the hand of his friend. What does “the beloved physician” do in the emergency? Nothing—absolutely nothing. He has no skill, no resources, no advice to offer. All he does is to look at the barbarians, and they at St. Paul. Again, during those three days that Publius lodged the two saints courteously, what did St. Luke, as a physician, for the father of his entertainer, whose complaint, we are loudly told, he described in the choicest medical terms? Again nothing—absolutely nothing. No apology either is offered in the narrative for this second strange neglect of his professional duties. St. Paul quietly ignores him, or puts him aside. He does not recommend his companion's unfailing healing salve or his new purgative elixir, but proceeds to heal the sick man in his own fashion. I appeal to medical men, if the whole narrative is not a contradiction of the claim made for St. Luke. Besides, the ease with which any quick-witted Greek, however unprofessional, could pick up a smattering of medical phraseology is pretty clearly shown by analogy. The writer of the Acts of the Apostles, in the latter part of that book, gives evidence of a wonderful familiarity with naval terms,

and yet he was no shipmaster nor sailor. He is as equally destitute of nautical skill and resources on the occasion of the shipwreck as afterwards, medically, on the island of Melita. But his phraseology is equally correct. The inference is that we have here an intelligent writer, who measured his words and who made skilful use of the materials at his command.

To return once more to the supposed influence which St. Luke may have exercised over St. Paul's phraseology, the evidence appears to me to point the other way. No doubt, St. Luke was with him at Rome, when he wrote three of his Epistles, but the character, age, and experience of St. Paul were so superior to those of his attendant and fellow-helper, that the probability of the great Apostle coming to him for instruction is very small indeed. St. Paul suffered all along from an impetuosity of language, which bespeaks the over-full and not the recipient mind. Moreover, if St. Luke, as a physician, had that presumed influence, would he not have restrained the Apostle from those unfortunate slights and contempts which he casts on this life, on the flesh, on bodily exercise, and everything that concerns the world. Could any medical man in the right use of his senses allow that sane and true religion is best based on an unsound and unhealthily physical life? That medical science had no voice in Pauline Christianity is manifest from the general tenour of St. Paul's Epistles and also from the opinion of early Churchmen. Tertullian stigmatises the surgeon, Herophilus, as a “butcher,” on account of his professional skill, and Augustine bitterly inveighs against “medical men, who are called anatomists,” with their “cruel zeal for science.” Later the Dominicans banished medical books from their monasteries, and Boniface VIII. interdicted dissection as sacrilege.

But there is another reason against the supposition. There is a large number of words and expressions common to Luke and the Pauline Epistles. In Dr. Davidson's work the list fills more than four pages of words and parallels consisting of ideas and words together in common. Whence does this similarity arise? Orthodoxy of course assumes that St. Paul kept copies of all his Epistles, the shipwreck notwithstanding, and that St. Luke at Rome had ample leisure inwardly to digest their contents, to gather all the facts of his Gospel and the narratives of his Acts, and to edit them with a Pauline flavour, “according to my gospel” (2 Tim. iii. 8.) The “obviously mere conjectures” (Bleek) of Irenæus and Tertullian are regarded as a solid foundation of fact. It is willingly forgotten that the numerous and contradictory traditions concerning St. Luke are merely decent veils to hide our complete ignorance. Modern criticism rejects this view as improbable. It looks upon these works as “unapostolic digests of early traditions” (J. M. Savage). Its reasons are numerous and of different value. I cannot enumerate them here. With “*Erigena*” I see that it is a question of probability; and the fact that we differ will perhaps induce him or some other well-informed writer to lay down the limits of probability in the matter within which we may agree.

F. T. P.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

SIR,—I am sure you will excuse me if I take exception to one or two affirmations contained in your recent leading article on “Cremation.” You seem to

infer from your reference to Bunhill Fields, the churchyard of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and the Old St. Pancras burial-ground, that no danger to health arises from interring the dead in large numbers among the living. I contend that in the metropolis we are surrounded with great and grave perils, and that our cemeteries may be classed as the greatest of all. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in one of his "Essays," thus poignantly depicts our national character for indifference to sanitation:—"We all of us," he remarks, "like to go our own way, and not to be forced out of the atmosphere of commonplace habitual to us. We like to be suffered to lie comfortably in the old strain of our habits, even although this strain may not be very clean and fine." It is to be feared, Sir, that the poisonous exhalations constantly emanating (but more particularly after rain during hot weather) from our London cemeteries are all the more to be dreaded by reason of the difficulty in discovering them, and the insidious action they exert on human life. There is evidence enough, however, to prove that putrid organic matters, the excess of carbonic acid and other noxious gases, and the low forms of cell-life therein contained and distributed, give rise to divers kinds of malaria, and induce zymotic diseases. This circumstance affects seriously the sanitary condition of neighbourhoods, so as to occasion much illness, and occasionally death, which is attributed to anything but its right cause. It is no secret that illness of a more or less serious kind always hangs about the localities of Brompton, Kensal Green, and Highgate Cemeteries; that there is difficulty in letting houses in some of those quarters; that grave-diggers frequently get overpowered, and that even mourners attending funerals grow suddenly sick. This I have myself experienced. It may be taken for granted that the great difference between one city, or one country, and another, in point of salubrity, consists in the greater or less proportion of soil which produces noxious effluvia. Now I take it that our surrounding cemeteries are breeders of pestilence. The numerous fresh accessions every day to the narrow areas appropriated for the dead render it impossible that the health of the metropolis can be free from menace. I understand that so great is the pressure upon space in some fashionable places of burial, that the Home Office regulation of nine feet long by four feet broad is constantly violated. You, Sir, appear to affirm that to complete the obliteration and resolution of the body takes but three years to accomplish. This, indeed, would be the case provided the earth-to-earth system were followed, and that such suitable virgin soil as that of the London Necropolis, Surrey, could be obtainable. As a matter of fact, however, London does not supply the kind of soil absolutely requisite for mortuary purposes, and thus the sanitary evil is intensified. The clayey soil around the metropolis defeats the object of rapid decay, and the consequent capacity for a second occupation in fourteen years. Under such conditions there is no telling how long bodies buried in strong coffins may remain in various stages of corruption, to pollute the atmosphere, poison the soil, and contaminate the water upon which we are dependent for domestic uses. In the Medical Report on Cemeteries, to be found in the last Report of the Local Government Board, Dr. Parsons lays it down that "the situation of a cemetery requires consideration from several points of view, of which the most important are its position with reference to dwelling-houses and sources of domestic water supply.

While public convenience requires that the cemetery shall not be too far distant, a due regard to public health requires that it shall not be dangerously near."

CLERICUS.

[We are not aware of any well-attested facts which prove that disease has ever originated from intra-mural cemeteries. We should have thought that the valley of the Thames and the Lea contained thousands of acres of gravelly soil suitable for burial.—ED.]

CHURCH PATRONAGE.—POPULAR ELECTION.

SIR,—Referring to my letter on the Patronage Bill, and to your private letter to me, the question of the best possible machinery for the nomination of our parish priests is an interesting one, although not more at present than a matter of speculation. In my opinion it is to be hoped that it may long so remain, for I do not desire to see patronage as it exists in our Church interfered with by legislation. All social and political organisations are, like other organised bodies, liable to disease; in the case of political institutions, forms of these diseases are often called abuses, and the most popular way of getting rid of the abuse or disease is frequently to cut away the diseased limb. It is a ready method; it is not, for all that, always efficacious to the desired end. If the disease be a constitutional one, to amputate a bad leg will not get rid of the disposition; and the amputation may remove the readiest means that the diseased humours have to procure a vent. I said, in my former letter, as much as that I think any attempt to interfere with the marketable nature of the property in advowsons by legislation will be found inoperative; and that to extinguish the property in advowsons by buying them up through compulsory purchase may be, as a project, quite set aside as impracticable, except as part of a general scheme of disestablishment, to which, in any form, both you and I would be opposed.

But supposing such a disaster—a disaster to both Church and State—should overtake us, then it would become the business of the Church, in its work of reconstitution, to provide for the manner of appointing the clergy to benefices. In answer to you I put down the following observations on this.

I have been recently in Ireland, where I made sundry inquiries as to the working of the nomination system in the Church of that country. I find that in the synod which reorganised their political system, now about a dozen years ago, there was a very strong and even universal feeling against the adoption of general popular election; and that there was also a feeling in favour of a uniform system for all benefices. I can coincide with the first of these instincts. The example of the Scotch elective plan, which is prevalent also amongst the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland, is not an example to be followed; there is everything about it unadmirable. The very details of it are repulsive, particularly the habit which the congregations have of getting candidates to preach sample sermons to them—a downright abomination. But I cannot concur in the propriety of establishing a uniform system of nominations. Under the old constitution of the Church of Ireland, the bishops had the patronage of several parishes—I believe Trinity College had some patronage—and the Crown had a few parishes—fewer, I think, in proportion than with

us. I do not see that there was any adequate reason for depriving the bishops of their powers, and I do not see why the Crown livings should not have been given to the bishops. However, this is now mere matter of criticism, although, if it should ever be our fate to have to reconstitute ourselves, I should be glad that this detail should not be overlooked. What the Irish synod did was to establish a secondary elective system. There is in each diocese a permanent nomination committee—the bishop, and three others, either clergy or laymen, elected by the synod of the diocese. There is in each parish a nomination committee elected by the vestry; and these two committees, convened by the bishop, form a board to appoint to a vacancy. I understand that in almost every instance the permanent diocesan nominators almost ostentatiously defer to the local men, and that accordingly the clergy appointed under the system are invariably such as the parishioners are at least prepared not to have any prejudice against. This is a palpably good result. But I was assured that if in any instance the parochial nominators attempted a job, or to introduce a manifestly improper man, then the bishop and independent nominators would certainly put down their foot. On the whole, I conclude that the system works well, and that there is no prospect of its becoming the origin of mischief to the Church.

You refer to the churchwardens as the most evident and proper representatives of the laity in parochial matters, as if the power of appointment to benefices might be lodged in them. For some reason which I cannot discover, the churchwardens have never been as important or as representative men in the Irish church as they generally are with us; and the Irish synod determined, I cannot say unwisely, to have an entirely new machinery to suit the new circumstances. In commending their legislation generally, you will understand that I do not advocate mere exact or slavish imitation.

I am almost sorry that you asked me to write about this subject. I do not like to contemplate the overthrow of the present relations between Church and State. I would much rather see things reformed, and reformed not by external agencies, but by the action of individual persons, and unions of persons, within the Church itself. B.

17th July, 1884.

“THE BISHOPS AND THE REVOLUTION.”

SIR,—I read with great pleasure your article this week. This is certainly a new departure, and one greatly to be regretted. Until lately, our bishops never took part, as far as I can remember, in merely political debates and divisions. When there was any measures closely affecting the interests of the Church, then they usually spoke and voted; and no one could feel offended at this. But, Sir, they have now gone beyond their powers, and have spent valuable time in taking part in a question with which, publicly, they have little to do. Some little time ago a discussion was allowed in the House of Commons as to the advisability of removing the bishops from the Upper House, and they narrowly escaped. Is it because they are trembling in their shoes, and are fearing another debate next session? Do they hope to influence the voting on that question by making friends with the Radical party? It certainly looks like it, and I, for

one, am very sorry that it should be so. You say with truth, “Their place is to mitigate the passions of the people, and not to pander to them.” Perhaps, when it is too late, they will learn this lesson. Our bishops are not so particularly loved by the people that they can afford to waste their time in the House of Lords. Can they not respect and be influenced by their Master’s words, called forth by an attempt to make Him arbiter in a purely secular matter, “Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?”

ARTHUR B. BARTLETT.

15, Church Road, Stoke Newington.

[The *Nonconformist* sneers at the action of the bishops as suggested by the recent narrow division on Mr. Willis’s motion.—ED.]

Reviews and Notices.

“THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST.”—London: William Reeves. Monthly.

WE have just seen a copy of this publication, called, as it is, “A Journal for those who work and think.” It is nicely got up, full of matter, and very cheap, the price being only one penny; but we question whether the publication of these journals will tend to produce harmony among the various classes of men.

The object of the promoters of this little publication is to promote Socialism on the basis of Christianity, but whether they will ever be able to do so time alone will prove.

As there seems to be some doubt in the minds of many as to what are the real objects which the Christian Socialists have in view, we think it best to quote from a letter signed E. F. T. in the columns before us. He says:—

“Our *ultimate* aims are these:—

“That interest (or profit on capital lent) shall cease in a socialistic state of society, there being *no want, pressure, need*, for any one to borrow and incur a personal debt, and no investment open to make it a paying game.

“That rent shall cease,—that is, except what is involved in adjusted payment for replacement of wear and tear and the quota for local and national expenses that may be levied in that form.

“That crushing competition (whether of sale by the worker of his labour, or by the trader of his wares) shall cease, and

“That personal exploitation (or making profit out of our fellow-creatures by direct slavery or wage-bondage) shall cease.”

There is a full account of the farewell banquet to the apostle of Socialism, Mr. Henry George; and with regard to the land question, he says:—

“The injustice, the iniquity, the inexpediency, and the absurdity of private property in land are visible in every direction.” What he means by this we do not quite understand. If a person sees a few fields adjoining his house for sale, and he has the money, and would like to acquire them in order to make his own hay, or sow his own corn or turnips, where, we ask, is the injustice, the iniquity of private property in land? Perhaps Mr. Henry George will tell us.

There is also a long article on “The True Individualism” and from it we cull one quotation which will perhaps help us to understand a little more what are the objects of the Socialists’ desire with regard to the land:—

"The one method by which all can become owners by the means of production, and at the same time reap the advantages which spring from the division of labour and improved machinery, is by placing the land and the capital in the hands of a representative State as the trustee of the whole people."

We are told with regard to Australian "slums" that even young colonies have not escaped the curse of unwholesome dwellings and back-"slums," but that the New South Wales Legislature have passed a Bill empowering the Mayor of Sydney to order the demolition of any old, dilapidated, or unhealthy dwelling within the city at his own cost.

We can only repeat what we said at the beginning, that, taken as a whole, we question very much whether the publications of such journals especially under the title of *Christian* can do any real good to the benefit of men. There is literary merit, and great care has evidently been taken in the editing of it; but whether Christianity will benefit, we very much doubt.

FUNERAL REFORM.--On Wednesday afternoon a conference, convened by the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, was held at Willis's Rooms, King Street, S.W., under the presidency of the Earl of Shaftesbury, one of the society's patrons. His lordship was supported on the platform by Mr. A. J. Beresford-Hope, M.P., Mr. S. Morley, M.P., Mr. F. Seymour Haden, the Rev. Canon J. Erskine Clarke, the Rev. W. T. Thornhill Webber, Dr. Septimus Gibbon, and the hon. sec., the Rev. F. Lawrence, vicar of Westow, York. The chairman, in his opening remarks, pronounced the retrenchment of mourning and funeral finery and feasting a most necessary reform. To the poor especially the burden was an intolerable one, and for all classes the simplification of the matter was both more decent and more Christian. On the motion of Mr. Beresford-Hope, M.P., seconded by Canon Erskine Clarke, it was resolved:—"That it is desirable to promote a better appreciation of the idea of Christian burial." The next resolution passed was proposed by Mr. Seymour Haden, seconded by the Rev. W. T. Thornhill Webber, and supported by Mr. C. S. Loch. It ran thus:—"That it is desirable to encourage the simplification and the cheapening of funeral and mourning ceremonial." The last resolution, which was carried on the motion of Mr. S. Morley, M.P., supported by the Hon. Dudley Fortescue and Dr. Gibbon, pledged the meeting to raise an adequate fund in support of the society's propaganda. Dr. Gibbon, as a medical officer of health, spoke of the great utility of the Metropolitan mortuaries, and suggested that each cemetery should provide a mortuary where the friends might meet the corpse at the hour of burial. The abolition of ostentatious processions through the streets would greatly promote economy.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archer, Rev. George Pollexfen, M.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.
Aylward, Rev. A. Frewen, Curate of Hinckley, Leicestershire; Vicar of Enderby.
Barton, Rev. Alfred John, B.A., Vicar of Guestwick, Norfolk.
Bickersteth, Rev. Samuel, Curate of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of Ripon.
Bingham, Rev. S. H., Vicar of Braintree; Rector of Scampton.
Dearden, Rev. William Buck, Vicar of Yeaveley, Derbyshire.
Dimsdale, Rev. Henry Cockfield, East London Missionary.

De Wolf, Rev. Robert Bibby, M.A., Curate of Sheffield; Perpetual Curate of Bessinghy.
Edmonds, Rev. Arthur J., Vicar of Great Gransden.
Flood, Rev. Luke Robert, M.A., Rector of Merrow.
Gray, Rev. A. E. Phillimore, M.A., Vicar of Poynton; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools.
Griffiths, Rev. Thomas Henry, B.A., Vicar of Chishall Magna.
Griffiths, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Llanspyddid, Brecon.
Haines, Rev. Willoughby Charles, Curate of Holy Trinity, Westminster; Vicar of Theddlethorpe All Saints.
Harris, Rev. Charles Sumpter, M.A., Rector of Melton, Suffolk.
Harper, Rev. Edward James, M.A., Vicar of Stoke Holy Cross, Norfolk.
Hearn, Rev. Thomas John, M.A., Rector of Wootton, Oxon.
Heather, Rev. William Montague, B.A., Vicar of Cauldon and Vicar of Waterfall, Staffs.
Jones, Rev. Edward Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Rolvenden, near Ashford, Kent.
Jones, Rev. Thomas Samuel, Perpetual Curate of St. Mary, Partington.
Kelly, Rev. Canon, Rector of St. Matthew, Manchester.
Laing, Rev. C. E., Curate of St. Botolph's, Colchester; Vicar of St. John the Divine, Gainsborough.
Langhorne, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Chaplain of Aix-la-Chapelle.
Lindsay, Rev. James, M.A., Chaplain of the Royal Sea-Bathing Infirmary, Margate.
Maddock, Rev. John Mortimer, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mark, Bury.
MacColl, Rev. Malcolm, M.A., Rector of St. Botolph, Billingsgate with St. George's, Botolph Lane; Canon of Ripon.
Meeres, Rev. C. E., Vicar of Pendeen, near St. Just; Vicar of Perranzabuloe.
Paget, Rev. Cecil George, Curate of Wimbourne; Vicar of Holt, near Wimbourne.
Parnell, Rev. Thomas Augustus, B.A., Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Quentin, Rev. G. A. F., Vicar of Shipdham, Norfolk.
Ridgeway, Rev. Charles J., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Edinburgh; Vicar of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate.
Robinson, Rev. Thomas Hector, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Woolton Hill.
Rogers, Rev. Thomas Phillips, Rector of Llanfihangel, Tor-y-Mynydd.
Sammons, Rev. Robert Thomas Huthersal, M.A., Curate of Owersby; Vicar of Saxilby.
Smith, Rev. Henry Edward, A.K.C.L., Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Weston.
Taylor, Rev. Robert, Perpetual Curate of St. Faith, Wandsworth.
Trench, Rev. F. C., Rector of St. John-the-Baptist, Tuebrook.
Trevelyan, Rev. W. Bouverie, late Vice-Principal of Ely College, Cambridge; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Great Peter Street, Westminster.
Walker, Rev. Herbert Stratton, B.A., Vicar of Borrowdale, Cumberland; Rector of Frankton.
Warren, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Saxilby; Vicar of Nettleham.
Westbrook, Rev. Francis Stephen, M.A., Chaplain of Canterbury Prison.
Whitehead, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Brampton; Perpetual Curate of Newlands.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beckford, Rev. Charles D., at 5, Cumberland Place, Southampton on the 18th inst., aged 86.
Carroll, Rev. Theophilus de la Cour, at 13, Kensington Gate, on the 18th inst.
Hutt, Rev. Thomas Granger, M.A., F.G.S., Head Master of the Grammar-school, Rotherham, at Hathersage, on the 15th inst.
Koven, Rev. Henry de, D.D., of the Diocese of Connecticut, U.S.A., and a resident of Florence, Italy, at Engelberg, Switzerland, suddenly, on the 10th inst., aged 65. R.I.P.
Metcalf, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Micklegate, York, at the Rectory, on the 17th inst., aged 47.
Scott, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Seaton and Bere, formerly Vicar of Chertsey, and Master in Merchant Taylors' School, London, at Seaton Vicarage, Devon, on the 15th inst., aged 59.



The Church of England Pulpit.

IN MEMORIAM.

DEDICATION OF A PULPIT.

BY THE REV. HERBERT S. SWITHINBANK,
M.A., VICAR OF ST. SAVIOUR'S, DENMARK
PARK.

SERMON PREACHED AT THE DEDICATION OF A
PULPIT, TO THE MEMORY OF JOHN JOSEPH
STEPHENSON, WHITSUN-DAY, 1884.

"The Lord gave the word; great was the company of the
preachers."—PSALM lxxviii. 11.

THIS is a psalm of-victory, the "Exsurgat
Deus" with which armies of old marched
into battle. It opens with the war-cry of God's
people in the desert, and this is its grandest verse
—a verse of triumph in a psalm of victory, read
as Hebrew scholars read it. But this is a special
psalm to-day, and we may surely take the words in
their Prayer Book sense—"The Lord gave the
word: great was the company of the *Preachers*."

In that sense they have been almost re-
inspired by the divine power of music. We
know how God moved Handel to use sacred
words and "bring all heaven before our eyes;"
and *this* strain in his "Messiah" at least we
can never forget: "The Lord gave the word."
It comes like that sound of Pentecost, a "sound
from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind;" comes
in one massive blast—"The Lord gave the word;"
and then the blast seems to strike some hill-side
clothed with forest. In an instant it is broken up;
every tree sways with its own peculiar note, as the
massive unison passes with a burst into intricate
harmony, "Great was the company of the
Preachers."

So was it at the Creation—"The Lord gave the
word,"—light and life burst into being. "He
spake and they were made; He commanded and
they were created."

So was it on the first Whitsun-day—"The Lord
gave the word;" it came with that sound from
heaven, and "great was the company of the
preachers."

So it is now in the Church and the world. In
one sweeping blast comes the command, "Preach
the Gospel: herald the good news"! and with a
thousand tongues, in a thousand tones, as varied as
the notes of every branch—aye, of every leaf in
the forest—"great *is* the company of the
preachers."

Now let us look closely at the text. I. "Adonai
Vol. XVIII.—No. 449.

gave the word." Adonai, the Lord of strength and
dominion; and that "word" means more than
"command." In the Hebrew it stands for
"promise," for "power," and for "victory." See,
then, the emphatic, the pregnant vigour of our
text:—

Adonai promised—and it was done;
Adonai commanded—and was obeyed;
Adonai spoke—and power went forth;
Adonai gave the word, and there was victory.

And when we preachers fail, when Christ crucified
drops out, and self (uncrucified) comes in, it is
because we have forgotten what that "word" is and
Who it is that gives it.

II. "Great was the company of the preachers."
Great, indeed; innumerable, if not infinite.

Vast, indeed, is the special order of preachers
from the earliest times until now. They do but
represent a far greater host. It must be so, or
those words would not be so pointedly emphatic—
"*Great* was the company. For are we not all
preachers, heralds of *something*, be it good news or
bad? We cannot be hid, we cannot suppress what
is in us, our very faces preach it. Old or young,
you have each a congregation—the circle in which
you move. Your own position is your pulpit; the
ruling motive of your life forms the text, and oh!
what a powerful text, for good or ill, that may be!
Your daily life is the sermon; your common acts,
words, tones, looks—those are its language, all the
more telling because you preach unconsciously.
Ah! we seldom think what hangs on all we do and
say! But besides that, you are ever *hearing*
sermons on every side. Your books, your news-
papers—you can take up nothing that does not
speak to you either the word of God or the word of
Satan; commonly it is both. Learn to close the
chamber-door of your heart when through the
portals of your ears troop in the fiends of shallow
cynicism, of feeble flippancy, of sensuality, of
bitter uncharity. But God speaks everywhere.
Listen to His voice; strain to catch His whisper,
and when you hear it, thank Him; dwell on it;
make it your own; work it up into your being;
pray over it!

Yes! "Great," indeed, "is the company of the
preachers"! But do not mistake me. God's
commandment is exceeding broad, but we also
know that "narrow is the way, and strait the
gate." The religion of culture is a fair-faced, foul-
hearted siren—a very Antichrist. The religion *in*
culture, seeing God in His own world,—that is but
the reverence of a mind that is truly catholic. And
when you pass from man to nature, to find
"Tongues in trees; books in the running brooks;
sermons in stones, and good in everything,"
you feel more than ever how vast is that host
of preachers, how goodly, how glorious that fellow-
ship!

* * * * *

"Sermons in stones." There is many a one

here. This pulpit is a silent and an eloquent preacher. (1) Hear it first as it might speak to an entire stranger, to one who knew not the spirit of love which has reared it. That marble has one sermon, this alabaster has another.

Marble. What is marble? A hard kind of limestone, often crystalline. And how comes it so? It is probably chalk, metamorphosed by intense heat and pressure, having (perhaps) crystallized as it cooled. And what is chalk?—(now we shall hear the sermon)—the remains of animals that have lived and died, a mass of organisms each beautiful and perfect in its parts, organisms so minute that one cubic inch (it has been calculated) may contain four times the entire human population of the globe; and when that soft mass is compressed into solid marble, and that marble measured by cubic feet (to say nothing of whole mountain ranges built of it), the mind almost reels under the contemplation. Aye! “*great* is the company of the preachers.”

And they preach—what? The Law of Sacrifice. Their death is our gain. And not *mere* sacrifice—that is a poor thing. A fine human character cannot be shaped out of that, any more than you could have cut pillars of soft chalk strong enough to support this weight. To get solidity, sacrifice must be transfused, metamorphosed by the intense growing heat of love (till, as the heat grows, not as it cools) the very binding force is changed from the spirit of the world to the Spirit of Christ. From a mere coherent it becomes a lovely crystalline. Nay, we can learn from the very polishing. Were those pillars left in the rough you might take them for common stone. One reason why God allows us to be together in great cities is surely that the roughness of the native block may be smoothed down and the mere surface of our daily life, the routine of business, the sacred common place of home, may all glisten with love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness—all the gifts of the Holy Spirit shed down at Pentecost.

Yes! but do you see the one serious defect in that sermon of the marble? It tells of sacrifice indeed, and of goodness built on sacrifice: it reflects Calvary up to a certain point, but to one essential of the Sacrifice of Christ, to one essential of ours it is dead—it does not preach a conscious, willing sacrifice.

And so when I touch *this* (alabaster) I feel we rise a whole world higher. How does alabaster come into the Bible? *Who* offered alabaster, and why? Two persons—the sister of Lazarus and the woman that was a sinner—Mary of Bethany and (it seems) Mary Magdalene—from both a costly gift in the very *abandon* of gratitude. To the one much had been given—nothing less than her own brother back from the grave; to the other much had been *forgiven*; and both therefore loved much.

And so this lovely stone raises us to the conception of a gift to God. That means, on the side of the giver, a sacrifice: it costs something; on the side of the God, an offering, returning to Him not the tithe of a tithe, but an infinitesimal part of all He has given us—the very overflow of grateful hearts. Such is this pulpit, and rightly is it made, not mainly of marble, but of alabaster, being not merely a sacrifice, but a thank-offering of love, beautified, even supported by sacrifice; and an offering coming from those to whom much has been given (is it not so with you?), to whom much has been forgiven (is it not also so with you?); for to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little.

And now I come to the special meaning of this as offered by you—the *occasion* of the offering. You remember our Lord prophesied that the alabaster vase offered by Mary of Bethany should be spoken of as a *memorial*, and as a memorial of *her*. He does not forbid gifts offered to Him in memory of men or women who have passed away—He approves of the principle.

It is, then, a memorial; and costly, chaste exquisite as it is, there is even *more* beauty in the feeling which prompted it—a *memorial* of him whom God raised up to build the spiritual fabric of this Church, to organise its visible worship, to foster its invisible worship, and God help his successor to be humbly grateful for the privilege of thus standing here! God help him, as time goes on, to prove less and less utterly unworthy of it!

Your first vicar has been with us here to-day, yes, *with us to-day*; here as really as he was with you that Sunday in August, the year before last—nay *more* really, for is not the next life *more* real than this, spirit *more* real than flesh, the invisible Church *more* real than the visible? If the Communion of Saints mean anything, it means this, that in our great act of worship *he* is kneeling with us, united in prayer with “*all* Christ’s *whole* Catholic Church.”

“He walked with God—and he was not; for God took him.” We know now the manner of his death—*death* do I call it? Say rather his passing—a gentle wafting to immortality—so it *was* with him.

Why God took him we can dimly guess.

“In His great world above,
A world of broader love,
God hath some great employment for His son:”

aye, and in His world below also; for I take it your memorial means one thing more, that he still speaks and you still listen. You will read his sermons; he is consecrated now, and so are they; they come now a voice from another world. The first text from which he preached in this church was this, “He shall save His people from their sins.” Can you not hear his voice, coming from the world of realities, asking you solemnly, lovingly,

"I have found Him *my* Saviour." Is He *yours*? " And by the power of the Holy Spirit given as on this day, work into your own heart-language, for life and death, the last words he uttered, faintly whispered (we know) on earth, but (can we doubt?) thrilling the host of heaven as all such heart-words do :

*"Nothing in my hand I bring ;
Simply to THY cross I cling."*

A RELIGION THAT COSTS NOTHING.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR H. POWELL, M.A.,
CURATE OF ST. JAMES THE LESS, WEST-
MINSTER.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. JAMES THE LESS,
WESTMINSTER, ON SUNDAY, JUNE 29TH, 1884.

"And the king said unto Araunah, Nay, but I will surely buy it of thee at a price : neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which doth cost me nothing," 2 SAMUEL, xxiv. 24.

IN consequence of David's sin in numbering the people, the tribes of Israel were suffering sorely. It was to be but a three days' pestilence, God had said, but it was three days of time so awful in its misery, that the nation reeled from the shock. Every hour the death-angel gathered into his insatiable garner hundreds and hundreds more of the people of Abraham's seed, and from Dan unto Beersheba, the wail of the bereaved went up into the ears of the God of Sabaoth. Already 70,000 people had fallen by the pestilence : in three days only, 70,000 of the choicest of Israel. Israel's cities were rapidly becoming cities of the dead, and the nation seemed likely to become a nation of the dead. Onward still, in his fell course of vengeance, the death-angel flew, and Israel every night "supped full with horrors." Something like the mourning, and lamentation, and woe, which had arisen before from their oppressors in Egypt, when all the firstborn were smitten down, arose now from Judah's hills. Jerusalem, the city of the great King—set in the midst of the everlasting hills—is threatened next : already in sombre flight God's destroying servant is there, his fatal hand stretched out as a beacon of affliction over the doomed city.

But in the maddest, most fiendish courses of misery that have ever darkened our earth, the lull comes at last. Now it came for Judah ; the Eternal said unto the angel, "It is enough ; stay now thine hand."

And as in national, so in individual experience. When concentrated misery is pushing her probe too far into the life, God stays her hand, saying, "Hold, it is enough." Thank God that it is so ! Thank God no life need be utterly dark, no dungeon so clammy, and low down, and black, but that through some chink in the wall some blessed rays of light from God's sun may enter in !

Then, by the threshing-floor of Araunah, or Ornan, the Jebusite, the angel stayed. Now at the same time as the mandate came from God to the angel, came also a message to Gad, the prophet, bidding David, the guilty cause of all this misery, go up to the said threshing-floor, and there rear an altar, and offer propitiatory sacrifice to Jehovah. Gladly and promptly David obeyed the command, and went up with his servants to the appointed place. With due reverence and respect Ornan came out to meet the king, inquiring the object of his visit. David hastened to explain that he was there to make peace with God for Israel, to offer sacrifice after the accustomed form, and for that purpose he wished to buy the threshing-floor, whereon to rear the altar of reconciliation. Now comes in the whole point of the history. Ornan, with characteristic Eastern generosity, offered to supply all that the king had come for, even his oxen for sacrifice, and the threshing instruments for wood for the sacrifice ; he offered all as a free gift to the king. And seeing that, as far as Ornan knew, he or his family might be the next victims of the pestilence, the offer was quite reasonable, and such an one as a well-to-do man, like Ornan, might with great probability make. "Take it, my lord, O king, take it all," eagerly said Ornan, "and may the Lord thy God accept thee !" "Nay," replied David, to whom palpably the meanness of such a course rose up vividly, "Nay, but I will surely buy it of thee at a price, neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which doth cost me nothing."

So for fifty shekels of silver the bargain was made ; upreared was the altar upon the solemn hills, the Lord was entreated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel.

A simple history, you will say, and so it is ; one of the many little glimpses we get into the way God dealt with the old world ; and yet, underlying this simple history, it seems to me there rests a whole world of thought. The doctrine of sacrifices, as under the old dispensation, is not easy to fathom completely. Of course one purpose was to foreshadow the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. But there must have been much more lying behind the system than this typical teaching. Such elaborate directions as are given as to the value, the composition, the way of celebrating these burnt offerings, were no doubt intended to serve a more direct purpose of teaching than what was merely typical. Why was it that men were to offer up a bullock, a he-goat, a lamb, for certain ranks of life, or a turtle-dove, or a pair of pigeons, in the poorer grades ? Could the blood of bulls or of goats, even then, take away sin ? We know that it could not. The doctrine is clearly laid down : "Behold, *to obey* is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." But there was one eternal principle of God, a principle which has been running all through the ages, which these

burnt offerings did teach. A burnt offering meant the giving up of a certain amount of pleasure, or trouble, or possessions, and was essentially, in the literal sense of the word, a *sacrifice*. The man who presented a burnt offering to God was bound to take a certain amount of trouble before he could do so. Wealth, or property, then, was far more equally divided than it is now. Much of it was in kind. In fact, these old sacrifices were an instance of that irrevocable law which prevails all through the universe, *the necessity of taking pains*. This was the old principle, so well put by Carlyle, "It is only with renunciation that life, properly speaking, can be said to begin." Renunciation, but of what? Of all that is satisfactory in life? By no means, but renunciation of the self-spirit in man. So the old Israelite, tending his sheep upon his native hills, when, upon a rude altar of unhewn stones, he offered up the meat-offering that had cost him either labour or privation to obtain, was asserting the principle that no man may offer unto the Lord that which costs him nothing. At any rate, did not these old sacrifices show that God requires from men *something that is worth having, something tangible, something of value*? It seems to me that this is a principle which is applicable to the least cultured as well as to the most cultured of mankind. "Thou shalt not appear before the Lord thy God *empty*."

Still I imagine that I can hear the criticism, that these archaic questions are not applicable to our age. The doctrine of sacrifices is not, but the principle which inspired them is surely in force as much now as then. Let us see how the question is affecting our mode of thought in this present day.

One of the most favourite maxims which we now hear quoted, and which has been quoted so often that we have almost come to believe it is true, is that we should not, as a rule, *force* ourselves to do anything. Wait till the desire comes—till the spirit moves you—till you are in the humour for it—say many of our advisers. Forced work, say they, is not good work. Sit down quietly, or take a walk, until you feel more disposed to attack your difficult task. Which, in other words, means this, wait until it is *easier* for me to do it. Wait until it costs me less exertion to perform it. And this principle seems to be an entirely false one, and I believe it is at the root of a great deal of the mischief in the world. Every daily duty is, or should be, a duty done to God—for God, whether it be wielding the workman's hammer, or presiding on the judicial bench. This plan, then, of not forcing ourselves to do a disagreeable duty, when reduced, means, offering unto the Lord that which costs me, not perhaps nothing, but at any rate not very much. Can you conceive an Israelite, to whom the time had come to offer to God his accustomed sacrifice, reasoning thus to himself? Would he have dared to advance the plea that he felt dis-

inclined to hunt for the he-goat or the ram for the offering? I trow not. Abraham made not this plea, when, with bursting heart, he bound his beloved Isaac upon the block, ready to offer unto his God half of his very life. O yes, there was a deep, deep pathos in the burning words of David when he stood upon the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite, and indignantly exclaimed, "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in offering unto the Lord my God that which costs me nothing." The most profound political economist could not have hit upon a truer standard of value—that which costs us some self-sacrifice to obtain. That is a true possession—that is a true offering—that is the salt of life—that God demands at our hands service which costs us something. May I not say now that there was the truest philosophy, the spirit of godliness, the kernel of worship, and the root of all true service, contained in this determination of David not to offer unto his God that which had cost him nothing?

The truth of this principle is shown in various ways. More especially it is shown by the increased store which we always set upon any possession which has cost us self-renunciation to obtain. The Canadian settler, who is surrounded by the rough-hewn chairs and tables of his own construction, probably values and cherishes these more than the owner of a fashionable London drawing-room does her magnificent furniture. In the one case they are the result of labour and toil, and very frequently, in the other case, they represent no more than some one else's toil. And it is an eternal law of God that we cannot have as much true pleasure from some one else's labour as from our own. Or if we do contrive to extort much pleasure from it, it is an indication of how very low we have fallen in character. It is one of the misfortunes of those who inherit possessions, that they are unable to appreciate the having them in anything like the same proportion as if they had toiled for them themselves. Misfortune, do I say? Rather should I say it is one of God's ways of showing people that the life which is not *taking pains* about something is no true life at all. Thank God, the days have gone by, we trust, or at least are rapidly passing away, when clergymen looked upon preaching a sermon much in the same way as a linen-draper does upon selling a yard of cloth—as something to be done, and got over. And the days have gone by, we pray, and may they never return, when the canon and the curate alike went to his pile of moth-eaten sermons, week after week, and took one by one, in shameful rotation, sometimes without even the decent pretence of first reading them through to himself. Yes, I am ashamed to say that the clergy have stood shamefully convicted before the laity in this respect, of offering unto God, in God's own house, that which cost them not labour, or pains—in fact, *nothing*!

But I desire to put before you the view of the

offering which every man has to make, willingly or unwillingly, unto his Maker. That offering is the sum of his own life's career. "We bring our years to an end," says the Psalmist, "as it were a tale that is told." And having brought them to an end, they are presented, as a long and patchy scroll, unto God who gave them. Now as regards this view, there has oft-times been a collision of thought between what is called religion, and common sense. In the naturally eager anxiety to tell perishing souls of the love of Jesus who died for them, an undue preponderance has sometimes been given to the vital and final efficacy of mere belief. I am not speaking now of a death-bed repentance—that is a manifest exception—but of the belief of adult and healthy life, and what it is supposed to do. Keen men of the world have said, "Oh, I will believe, that is easy enough, and you tell me that if I believe, all will be well with me." Keener men of the world saw the fallacy and unreality of such a system as this. Rightly they asserted that if religion, or belief, did not influence conduct, it was powerless. Hence a collision arose because men did not thoroughly grasp the principle that we cannot make an offering which, in the nature of things, can be acceptable to God, if it costs us nothing. Christ's word to those whom he called was ever, "Follow me!" Through the thickets of life, through evil report and through good report, through persecution, misrepresentation, and all sorts of obloquy; through ignorance and vice; sometimes 'with emptied arms and treasure lost;' with hearts all lacerated by suffering, still, I bid you, follow me!"

I conceive that when the smoke of the years of our life ascends in upward flight to God, that only can be an acceptable, or in any sense an offering or sacrifice to Him, which bears the trace of the eternal principle of *having taken pains with it*. Earthly successful careers, which in many ways are typical of spiritually successful careers, are produced by the age-long genius of taking pains. *The fool physical, and the fool spiritual, is the man who takes no pains*. The one cannot succeed, neither can the other. In an infinitely higher way our Saviour teaches us this same lesson: "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me." What else is this but saying that life—life—that magnificent possession given to us sons of God—this life is a sacrifice, living is a sacrifice, our years are a sacrifice, and this sacrifice, when we shall enter the portals of Hades-land, we must take, and present, and lay it upon the altar of God. Go up, then, O man, get out your shekels (of gold, of energy, of usefulness, of *action*), go up, and buy the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite; or, in other words, see that the life which you are, a few years hence, to offer up to God, be not a life which has cost you no struggles, no strivings, nothing. You would not offer to a mortal so many cubic

feet of air, or gallons of water, because intrinsically these are valueless. Valuable actually, because essential, but valueless relatively, because costing you nothing. So you will not offer to God a spiritual life which has been unconvulsed by struggle or undisturbed by effort; "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father."

Perhaps then the question to be asked is this: Is your spiritual life costing you anything? Especially those of you who have leisure, what sacrifice of self is the spiritual life costing you? Sacrifice of money is but a small part of the life sacrifice. The money is not yours—the life is. Many of you are toiling, and wearing out brain and body over the earthly life, are you straining every fibre, too, to make beautiful and glorious the life which is hid with Christ in God? I am not hinting that the spiritual life and the earthly life are separate and distinct—I know at least that they need not be—but do not make the spiritual life earthly, but make the earthly life spiritual. Do all to the glory of God. But to those who find but little to do, there is the danger. Many a life stagnates because it eats away its heart in comfortable inactivity. Those of you who are fed, and clothed, and served, and protected, and toiled for by thousands of suffering others, let me tell you, *you cannot pay for these things*, therefore your life, when laid before God, must be a life that has cost you something, some scouring, some cleaning, if God can accept it. Yes, assuredly, you too must go up upon the hill of God, and by dropping your contribution of usefulness, real usefulness, into God's world, must help God. Thus you too may acquire and present to God the acceptable offering of the *purchased* threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite.

And while I am thus seeking to enforce the principle that God, in this spiritual life of yours, calls for something that is worth having, and not a set of cold beliefs, let me not for one moment overshadow the efficacy of the Great Sacrifice. Our spiritual life is a very ugly piece of patchwork at the best of times, and would not bear inspection. Torn and ragged, its rents would proclaim our shame, depended we for support upon its feeble texture. We have a better and complete sacrifice, that which is not our own, even the sacrifice of the Saviour of mankind. We cannot ourselves get the shekels to buy up Ornan's threshing-floor, but what we cannot procure Christ has supplied. And the smoke of the offering has gone up to God, *and the plague is stayed*.

And the greatness and the reality of that sacrifice of love which Jesus made for the whole world, and for you, is an example of the sacrifice which He asks you to make of the jewel He has given you—your life! A diamond it is, unpolished, uncut, but capable of infinite beauty of form, infinite purity of lustre. He will help to shape and mould

it, then to brighten and polish it, and then to keep its lustre undimmed and its sparkle clear.

Finally also, God will ask you for it, *i.e.*, your life, and if worthy, He will place it, a bright jewel, in the eternal crown. High destiny! Great end! How can I, thus conscious of the eternal plan, do else than present to Him my noblest and my best? I will not offer unto the Lord my God that which has cost me nothing.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1884.

THE KING AND HIS SATELLITE.

MR. BRITON RIVIÈRE has a very striking picture in this year's exhibition of the Royal Academy. A lion, rather bigger, it must be confessed, than life, stalks towards a herd with head erect, seeing and scenting his prey, while around his heels a pack of little jackals are prowling, ready, as soon as the lordly beast has struck his game and satisfied his hunger, to fight among themselves for the leavings. We do not know whether the artist has enough of satire in his composition to intend this picture for an allegorical portrait of Mr. Gladstone and his courtiers, but certain it is that the resemblance is complete. The Prime Minister is marching steadily onwards to the great prize of his ambition. To break down the last institution that ventures to resist his despotic will, and to live the three or four years of active life that may yet remain to a septuagenarian as absolute master of the whole British commonwealth—that is the design. Immaterial to him that he leaves nothing behind to replace that which he destroys; he will have tasted the sweets of absolute power, and have occupied undisputedly the first position among contemporary Englishmen. Disastrous as his work is likely to prove to the nation, which will be condemned henceforth to be ruled by demagogues like Joe Chamberlain, instead of by ancient and venerable institutions, his aim is somewhat majestic, selfish though it be.

Kühn das Vermöhen, herrlich der Lohn.

When he has satisfied himself with this lordly prey, there remains the offal, which, to do him justice, he is magnanimous enough to despise—the

canonries, the stars and garters, the peerages, the bishoprics—for distribution among his jackals. The man who, like Mr. Gladstone, systematically distributes his patronage for personal and private motives, invites around him a crowd of suchlike followers. Fault has been found with the recent appointment of Mr. Malcolm McColl to a canonry of Ripon. To us that gentleman appears to unite in himself every quality that the Premier seeks in the ecclesiastics whom he delights to honour. He is a devout believer in the whole creed of sacerdotalism; he is a Liberal to the extent of exhibiting himself on the platform of the party; and he is a devout admirer and adherent of Mr. Gladstone's own. What could be wanted more? But, in addition to these general merits, this new canon rendered the Premier a very remarkable service at a critical moment of his career. For he was the very person who, along with another still more eminent divine, saw the famous impaled man on the banks of the river Save. It can hardly be quite forgotten that at the time when Mr. Gladstone was using the Bulgarian massacres as a lever to overthrow his rival, Lord Beaconsfield, there was a great demand, on his account and that of his party, for atrocities, to add weight to his denunciations of the unspeakable Turk. At that time two divines took a tour into Eastern Europe, not without a desire to assist, if possible, Mr. Gladstone's noble crusade against bloodshed and oppression. To these two witnesses was vouchsafed the sight of an actual atrocity. From the deck of an Austrian steamer, on the river Save, they saw an object on the Turkish bank, which looked uncommonly like a man set up upon a pole. The two divines wrote off at once to *The Times*, and Europe rang with the harrowing story of the Impaled Man. However, inquiries on the spot failed to identify the impaled man himself, or his impaler, or the circumstances of the crime, or the place where it took place. And gradually the public mind settled down to the belief, which is probably shared now by the two passionate pilgrims themselves, that the object which they saw was a scarecrow. We recall this incident at the present moment, because no time could possibly furnish better opportunities for a tour in search of atrocities. The reverend canon, in his new office, will enjoy much *otium cum dignitate*, and have plenty of time for touring. We venture to suggest as an object for his next eastern excursion the interesting country around Suakim. There he will find not one corpse or scarecrow only, but a great many thousands of objects, which confess by their horrible odour that they are real and genuine corpses. And, whereas in the Turkish case, it required all Mr. Gladstone's rhetoric and dialectics, to establish the remotest imaginable connection between the massacres and the rival whom he desired to overthrow, the corpses around Suakim are those of men killed by soldiers acting

under Mr. Gladstone's own command, and fighting for the credit of his ministry; and therefore the guilt of their death lies directly at his door. If, now, an Oriental tourist, possessing the Premier's confidence, would bring home a trustworthy account of the appearance, the numbers, the smell, of these victims of his policy, he might perhaps bring compunction home to the rhetoric-blinded conscience of his patron, at once the most sanctimonious and the most unscrupulous of politicians. The only possible defence which a casuist can devise in defence of the atrocities in the Eastern Soudan, is to maintain the proposition that killing is no murder, when perpetrated in the interest of the Liberal party and of Mr. Gladstone's personal career.

OAKHAM SCHOOL.

THE little capital town of the smallest county in England, kept high festival on the 29th ult., to celebrate the three-hundredth birthday of its famous Grammar School. The inhabitants profusely decorated their quaint old streets, market-cross, and even church with triumphal arches, flags, and bunting, emblazoned with such mottoes as "Let Oakham hold her own," "He is not dead whose fame survives," and *Floreat Schola Oakhamiensis*—mottoes which were abundantly justified by the Bishop of Hereford (an old Oakham scholar), for he read out from an examination-list of 1833 the names of two Lord Bishops (Ellicott and Atlay) and two archdeacons (Sherringham and Cheetham), of two Smith's prizemen and five Bell Scholars in the University of Cambridge, of three General Officers in the army, and others who have attained to high positions in the learned professions and in the Civil Service of the country. The sermon preached by Bishop Atlay was most appreciative, appropriate, and practical—a sermon which we thought might well be taken as a model discourse for such an occasion. We trust, therefore, that we may be permitted to print and give it a wider circulation. The speeches by the hereditary trustee and patron of the school, Mr. A. C. Johnson, at the opening of the new swimming-bath and at the distribution of prizes in the Agricultural Hall were eminently practical and appreciative. He was followed at the Hall by Mr. G. H. Finch, M.P., Mr. J. Lowther, M.P., and Lord Burghley, M.P., who respectively advocated modern languages, athletics, and the scientific training for technical education in simple and telling speeches. Bishop Mitchinson, Coadjutor Bishop of the diocese, in a short and able speech, advocated the doctrine we have so often preached, that the *corpus sanum* is a necessary postulate for the *mens sana*, he so strenuously urged that cleanliness is next to godliness, that we do not despair of his one day proclaiming that it is godliness. Bishop Atlay

reviewed the masters and pupils, and method of teaching in his day, and hinted that the zeal of the present day for reforming the smaller, local and old-fashioned schools off the face of the country was not according to knowledge,—at least to the knowledge which was sought after in order to build up, and which, as he had told us in his sermon, was wisdom. Archdeacon Cheetham endorsed this opinion by saying, if a census were taken of those who had gone from the smaller schools to the Universities, and the honours they had there obtained, were compared with the honours of those who had gone from the great schools, the balance would be greatly in favour of the smaller schools. He praised old Dr. Doncaster's method of teaching English literature: and said that this school, in now teaching French and German, was absolutely carrying out the founder's intention. In Archdeacon Johnson's time Latin was the foundation of learning, not because it was the language of the great writers of antiquity, but because nobody could be a scholar or professional man without it. But since Continental scholars and professional men had ceased to write in Latin it was necessary to learn French and German. The Vicar of Oakham briefly adverted to the severe struggle which his parishioners had had with the Endowed School Commissioners "to hold their own." After the Head Master (the Rev. E. Vere Hodge, M.A.) had expressed his thanks to the townspeople, and to his assistant-masters, for their aid in promoting the festival, he described the present flourishing condition of the School, which now has eighty-six pupils. The prizes were presented by Lord Burghley, M.P.

NOTES OF A FLYING VISIT TO THE ROCK OF CASHEL.

BY REV. COURTENAY MOORE, M.A., RECTOR
OF MITCHELSTOWN.

ON one of the beautiful days of "the leafy month of June," of this year of grace, I, in company with a friend, carried out a long-cherished intention to visit the celebrated Rock of Cashel. The journey from our starting point to the Rock was two-and-twenty Irish miles; and as we traversed a region remote from railways, we availed ourselves of the national conveyance—an Irish jaunting-car. In travelling through the agricultural districts of Ireland, if it does not happen to be a holiday or market-day, you cannot fail to be struck with the almost utter loneliness of the roads. You hardly meet a living creature of any kind, and the fields seem almost as deserted as the highways. It reminds one of the song of Deborah—"In the days of Shamgar, the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways; the inhabitants of the villages ceased; they ceased in Israel until that I, Deborah, arose—that I arose a mother in Israel." But what is this sound that suddenly breaks the stillness of the air? It is undoubtedly the sharp ping of the rifle, and it is repeated in quick succession. As there is no "big

game" in the neighbourhood, can it be a battue of landlords, for we are in the county Tipperary? No; we come nearer and come upon a company of soldiers—"holding out cold iron"—practising rifle-shooting at long ranges against the mountain side. There is no mistake—the men are all in "England's cruel red;" and we now see more soldiers than we have seen peasants all the way hitherto. The English garrison can never be safely withdrawn from the Emerald Isle, for, to use a chemical analogy, the elements of Irish disaffection always exist in solution, and at any moment the slightest concussion may precipitate them into definite crystalline shape. But on we speed; and having reached Cahir, a town somewhat more than half-way on our journey, we here obtain a fresh horse, and make a new departure. As we get nearer and nearer to Cashel, the road is a little enlivened by various families of strolling beggars, who are almost the only pedestrians. Their garments do not smell of myrrh, and are abundantly "looped and windowed;" but as the day is broiling hot, ventilation is rather an advantage. From the side upon which we approached it, the Rock was not visible until we were tolerably close upon it: the intervening distance was soon covered; and only waiting to put up our horse and order dinner at Corcoran's Hotel, we hurried off to the venerable ruins. The Rock is said to be about 300 feet high; it is not at all so steep nor so elevated as the Castle Rock of Edinburgh, and is also unlike it in being entirely carpeted with green turf. The view from this Irish Rock is probably about the finest inland view in the British Islands. Seven counties are visible from it, and this immense landscape is beautifully diversified with wood and mountain. To this day the saying of Cromwell is recorded when surveying the Irish Canaan from this spot—"This is a country worth fighting for!" Cashel was one of the places which surrendered to him without a struggle. Seventeen companies of Ulster Foot quitted it in disorder on his approach, though he had only 200 infantry with him, and no ladders or guns. After some severe fighting in the county Kilkenny, he returned to Cashel, where he speaks in one of his letters of "having good plenty both of horse meat and man's meat for a time, and being, as we may say, even almost in the heart and bowels of the enemy, ready to attempt what God shall next direct." He subjected the county Tipperary to a contribution of £1,500 a month. Whether the visitor therefore thinks of the political associations of the Rock or its much more ancient ecclesiastical ones, or of the magnificent panorama which lies outspread before him from its summit, or of all combined, it is a place of the deepest interest. The weather on the day of our visit was perfect, and we stood entranced on that historic hill-top.

"Lass mich in vollen, in durstigen Zügen
Trinken die freie, die himmlische Luft."

I do not profess to give any accurate description of the celebrated ruins on the Rock. They consist of the ruins of an ancient royal palace, a cathedral, and a chapel. They are all now in charge of the Irish Board of Works, which department lately spent nearly £4,000 in clearing out the ruins, and in making them secure against further injury by decay. The Cathedral, which is roofless, is exactly in the form of a Latin cross; but even more interesting still is King Cormac's Chapel, a beautiful specimen of Norman architecture. As you enter the grounds, one of the first objects which engages your attention is a large block of granite, on which is a rough drawing of the Sun. This no doubt

dates from Pagan times. On this block is placed a stone carving, somewhat in the shape of a Calvary, on one side of which is a figure of our Lord, and on the other of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland. There are not many very old monuments in the Cathedral; but a large stone sarcophagus, said to be King Cormac's, is placed in his chapel. It seems to be conjecture that it was really his. This chapel must be peculiarly interesting to the ecclesiastical antiquarian, and its stone roof has kept it in very perfect preservation. One of the round towers for which Ireland is famous forms another striking feature of this venerable group of ruins.

"The spot is sacred:—ruined arch and column,
The traceried window and the altar-stair
Tell of a worship, primitive and solemn,
That in the ages gone was offered there."

So many desolating wars have swept over Ireland that comparatively few of the ancient churches remain, and there is, therefore, all the more reason to cherish and preserve such ruins as those of Cashel as national monuments. There is a modern cathedral in the town, dedicated to St. John the Baptist. It is small, but very decent and orderly. It has been much improved by the present Dean and his two predecessors. The present Deanery is the old archiepiscopal palace, and is an extremely fine residence; rather out of keeping, however, with the income of a disendowed Dean. Visitation dinners are still held in the hall, where forty clergy dine together.

"There are forty feeding like one."

The present study was the wig-room in the old palmy days, but we should say this is not a come-down, but rather promotion. It is supposed that the Continent will be closed to many travellers this summer, because of the cholera. Why not try Ireland?—it abounds in beautiful scenery. Travelling in Ireland is beneficial both to the natives and to the visitors; not merely to the latter financially, but to both in the way of removing many unfounded prejudices. Irishmen must needs visit England, as it is the high road to so many other countries; but what multitudes of educated, cultivated, travelled Englishmen there are who have never been in Ireland! Lord Beaconsfield was never in Ireland; and Mr. Gladstone has visited it only once. We have heard of an Irish Roman Catholic clergyman who once said, "They may talk of Rome and Jerusalem, but thank God I was never out of Ireland;" but it would seem there are many Englishmen who practically say, "Thank God I never was *in* Ireland." It is to them a Galilee, out of which they think no good thing can come; but let them come and see.

NOTES.

The Irish name of the Rock of Cashel is Sidh-dhruim, or the Fairy Ridge. Different derivations have been given of Cashel, one is Cois-aíl—rent rock; for Cashel was the ancient capital of Munster, and there the kings resided and received their tribute. Mr. Joyce discards this as fanciful, and derives Cashel from the common Irish word Caiséal, a circular stone fort.

Cormac's Chapel was consecrated in 1134; it was built by King Cormac MacCarthy. Another theory is that it was built by King Cormac McCullinan, in the 10th century. The Cathedral on the Rock was built at the close of the 12th century.

Henry II. visited Cashel soon after his arrival in Ireland, in the end of the year 1171, and received there the submission of several Irish princes. By his desire a synod was held there early in the following year, in which it was decreed that henceforth the Church of Ireland should be conformed to that of England. Christian, Bishop of Lismore, presided as Papal Legate.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—When Papias gave his account of the origin of a work written, as he believed, by St. Matthew, and when he gave an account of the origin of a work written, as he believed, by St. Mark, the latter account derived from one whom he calls “the elder,” and who seems to have been John the elder, “the disciple of the Lord,” I believe that he was offering an account of the origin of our present Gospels of Matthew and Mark. I ought, however, to add, that I am not prepared to maintain that our first Gospel was the immediate work of the Apostle Matthew. I believe it to be a work of the same kind as the second and third Gospels, *i.e.*, derived, not original,—derived, very probably, in a special degree from the teaching of St. Matthew. That it was our first Gospel, however, that was known to Papias, and that he was offering an account of its origin, has, among other probabilities in its favour, the evidence that a contemporary of Papias, *viz.*, Tatian, used our four Gospels. Tatian was probably a younger contemporary; but he seems to have been by no means a contemporary merely in the sense in which a man of thirty might now claim to have been a contemporary of Lord Palmerston, for it is said by Eusebius that Tatian, during the first part of his life (*i.e.*, apparently before his conversion to Christianity), lectured (*σοφιστεύσας*) in the learning of the Greeks, and had obtained no small reputation among them (*Ecc. Hist.*, iv. 16). Now Tatian became a disciple of Justin Martyr, whose martyrdom has been variously assigned to years ranging from A.D. 148 to 165. The death of Papias is assigned by Dean Plumptre to A.D. 170; it seems at least probable, therefore, that Tatian had reached mature manhood before the death of Papias. Now Tatian wrote (it is believed after the death of St. Justin) “a curious sort of patchwork or combination of the Gospels, and called it the *Diatessaron*, which is still current with some” (*Eusebius, Hist. Ecc.*, iv. 29, cited by Sanday, “Gospels in the Second Century”). It was acutely remarked by Paley in connection with the evidence for the Christian Scriptures to be derived from the existence of commentaries and “harmonies,” Tatian’s Harmony among the rest, that “men do not write comments upon the publications of their own times,” and that therefore, in the time when the Commentaries were written, the Christian Scriptures were regarded as ancient books. I must admit exceptions to the rule that men do not comment on productions of their own times. There are, for example, works extant that might perhaps be called commentaries on poems of Tennyson; but I have little doubt that Paley’s rule holds in the great majority of cases, and therefore Tatian’s Harmony of the “four” gives us a clear balance of probability, in my opinion, that at the time of its composition our four Gospels had an established credit, and were believed to have been a considerable time in existence. I am not unaware that doubts have been thrown out, on the ground of one or two variations in the patristic evidence, whether Tatian, according to the plain statement of Eusebius, really wrote and named a harmony of the “four;” but I understand from Dr. Sanday’s Essay, read by him at the Church Congress at Reading (I

am sorry to say that I write in this instance from recollection only) that the question has been set at rest by the discovery of a copy of, or commentary on, the *Diatessaron*, which confirms the account in Eusebius. Is the probability given us by Tatian’s work that in his day there existed an established “four,” and that “four” our four Evangelists, confirmed; or is it set aside by an examination of the writings of his teacher, Justin? I am strongly of opinion that the probability is confirmed. Reserving the evidence for the genuineness of the fourth Gospel for a future letter, I propose now to consider the question whether Justin used our Synoptic Gospels: assuming as the basis of the discussion the genuineness, which I believe is generally admitted, of the first Apology addressed to the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius, and of the Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew, who is represented in the dialogue as having fled from the recent war in Judea,—the war, namely, in which the insurrection of Bar-Cochebas was crushed A.D. 132-135.

From these two works we glean an account of our Lord’s life and teaching which corresponds in the main and in several particulars with that contained in our first three Gospels; but to the theory that Justin derived his history from our Gospels it is objected—

1. That Justin nowhere names our Gospels as the writings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, while he repeatedly refers to Old Testament books by name, and to St. John as the author of the Apocalypse.

2. That there is very considerable verbal variation in Justin from our Gospels, and that passages which we have in different Gospels are combined in one by Justin.

3. That various statements about the Gospel history are not confirmed by our Gospels, such, for instance, as that our Saviour was born in a cave near Bethlehem (a statement found in the *Protevangelium of James*); that the Baptist sat by the Jordan (a statement Justin makes three times over); that at our Lord’s baptism a fire was kindled on the Jordan (a statement found, however, in one of the best MSS. of the old Latin version of Matthew, but also in the Nazarene form of the Gospel according to the Hebrews); that the mockers set our Lord down on the judgment seat, and that, as a carpenter, He made ploughs and yokes (a statement found in the Gospel of Thomas).

4. That certain quotations in Justin which diverge from our Gospels appear in similar form to Justin’s in the Clementine Homilies, from which it is inferred that the pseudo-Clement and Justin used the same Gospel, and that that Gospel was not one of our four.

Before endeavouring to set forth the positive evidence for Justin’s use of our Gospels, let me endeavour to put the reader in possession of the answers which seem to me effectually to meet the first three objections and to diminish the force of the fourth, which will then contain nothing that need obstruct my main argument. The first objection can have little force unless it be supposed that the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, to which Justin refers for the Gospel history, consisted of one treatise only. If the *Memoirs* consisted of more than one treatise, it may be assumed with little or no risk that the separate treatises had separate titles. Now as Justin, except in one instance noted lower down in this letter, makes no approach to giving separate titles to any of the *Memoirs*, I argue that the suppressed titles are just as likely to have been

"According to Matthew," "Mark," "Luke," and "John," as "according to the Hebrews," "to St. Thomas," "to St. James," &c. If Justin was silent as to separate titles (of Gospels) known to him, there seems no special presumption from his silence against his use of our Gospels more than against his use of any other, unless indeed that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not authenticated by the name of any author. That Justin did use separate documents (which it is tolerably certain would have separate names) seems a high probability for the following reasons:—

(a.) That he affirms his Memoirs to have been written by "His Apostles and those who followed them." A single work, which would seem to have had at least four authors, is not likely to have existed, unless in the shape of a Harmony.

(b.) That he refers to "his" (seemingly Peter's) "Memoirs." It must be observed that the Memoirs are called the Apostle's Memoirs, but never Christ's; and it seems fair to infer, with Norton and Westcott, that "his" refers to the supposed author, not to the subject of the Memoirs.

(c.) That in the literary age which followed Justin it is likely we should have had some record of any work so comprehensive as the Memoirs must have been, if the Memoirs formed one treatise only; but no such trace has been discovered or claimed, as far as I am aware.

(d.) That in words the genuineness of which has been denied, but on *à priori* grounds only, Justin says of the Memoirs "which are called Gospels."

(e.) That it is probable, from the difficulty of harmonizing the accounts, that the narratives connected with our Saviour's birth and infancy given by St. Matthew and St. Luke respectively are not derived from any common documentary source, but Justin gives particulars contained in Luke's account and particulars contained in Matthew's account.

To the second and third objection it may be answered that Justin is also very loose in several of his references to the Old Testament, referring to Jeremiah ("Apology," i. 51), a prophecy which in the Dialogue with Trypho (ch. xxxi.) he correctly refers to Daniel, stating ("Apology," i. 60) that it is related in the Mosaic writings that, when the Israelites "were in the desert, venomous beasts, vipers and asps and serpents of every kind, destroyed the people; on which Moses, from the inspiration and direction communicated by God, took brass and formed it into the shape of a cross, and placed it on the holy tabernacle, and said to the people, 'If you look upon that figure and believe, you shall be saved,' and when this was done he related that the serpents died, and recorded that by this means the people escaped death." I hope the reader, if he is not fresh in knowledge of the Pentateuch, will look out the passage, in Numbers xxi., on which the above is founded by Justin. I doubt if there is any such bold variation from the Gospel records in Justin's writings. The fact is, as Dr. Sanday points out, quotation was not, in Justin's day, as accurate as now, for physical reasons, viz., books being rarer, access to them was more difficult, and long rolls were far more troublesome to search for a passage than are reference Bibles. It must be admitted, on the other hand, that the above instance of wrong citation from the Old Testament is exceptionally strong, and that Justin has a far larger proportion of accurate quotations from the Old Testament than from our Gospels, supposing he used them.

Dr. Sanday "roughly" tabulates as follows:—

	Exact.	Slightly variant.	Variant.
Quotations from Old Testament	10	7	9
Quotations from Synoptic Gospels	10	25	32

Dr. Sanday, however, does not seem to have noticed the full bearing of a fact which he just refers to, viz., that the proportion of accurate quotations from the Old Testament is far higher in the Dialogue with Trypho, *i.e.*, when Justin was arguing with well-informed Jewish opponents; for the treatise, professedly a dialogue with a Jew, was intended, it is to be supposed, to convince the Jews. If you count the quotations in the "Apology" only, assuming the general accuracy of the tabulated statements in Dr. Sanday's work, the proportion stands as follows:—

	Exact.	Slightly variant.	Variant.
Quotations from Old Testament	6	3	15
Quotations from Synoptic Gospels	4	12	17

I should be sorry to think that this reflects on Justin's good faith. I suppose that, human nature being what it is, we almost all have an element in us of "eye-service," and work better from the consciousness that our work will be critically inspected. It is further noted in Norton's "Genuineness of the Gospels" that, out of seventeen instances where Justin repeats his quotations, in "more than half of them, as repeated, there is a striking want of correspondence, either in the words themselves or in their connection with other words quoted." It seems to follow that Justin did not quote his authority, whatever it was, with verbal accuracy, always unless it be supposed that he had access to records varying in these instances from one another. Norton further observes, "I have noticed in his Apologies and Dialogues seven quotations from Plato. There is one of them, consisting of only four words in the original, which would be verbally accurate if Justin had not inserted a particle; none of the others are so." The main point, however, that I wish to press is Justin's inaccuracy in quoting the Old Testament. It has been suggested by Dr. Sanday and by Mr. Matthew Arnold that Justin had scarcely begun or not begun to look on the Gospels as Scripture. This may be the case, but does not follow from his looseness of quotation, since he is often loose in his quotations from the Old Testament, which he certainly looked on as Scripture, representing Moses as keeping his *uncle's* flock (probably confusing the histories of Jacob and Moses), and in another place, professing to quote Zechariah, but blending together Zechariah, Isaiah, and Joel. I take this last statement (as also that about the quotations from Plato) from Norton without verifying it; but I can answer for the existence of similar cases. Lastly, where St. Justin professedly refers to the Memoirs as his authorities, the amount of verbal agreement with the Gospels seems (according to Westcott's "Bible in the Church," page 102) to be in an unmistakeably greater proportion than in Justin's more indefinitely made citations.

The fact about the coincidences with the Clementine Homilies I gather from Sanday's "Gospels in the Second Century" to have been as follows:—In about six quotations common to Justin and the pseudo-Clement, there is special agreement between them in differences from the words of the Synoptists, joined

however, to differences in these passages between Justin and the pseudo-Clement. In about six other instances "the quotations common to the Clementines and Justin have to all appearance no relation to each other. Speaking generally, we seem to observe, in comparing Justin with the Clementines, phenomena not dissimilar to those which appear on a comparison with the Canonical Gospels. There is perhaps about the same degree at once of resemblance and divergence" (Sanday). It is worth noting that in one instance of thrice-repeated quotations Justin agrees once with the Clementines and once with Matthew, and once approaches the Clementines. Whether these phenomena point to the use of some one document in common with the pseudo-Clement, or whether the instances of agreement are popular misquotations like "neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive," so commonly current now, I do not offer to decide. Let Justin have used a fifth Gospel, if you like. I hope in my next letter to satisfy the reader that Justin quotes from Matthew and Luke, and that it is at least a high probability that he quotes St. Mark. When I began this letter, I hoped to have concluded my statement of evidence for the Synoptic Gospels in it, but it has run to greater length than I expected. Will it help to keep up the reader's interest if I mention that in Justin's time, according to his own statement, the Memoirs of the Apostles, as well as the writings of the Prophets, were read in Divine Service. It was not then a likely time for unnoticed changes as to the Gospels received by the Church.

ERIGENA.

P.S.—Of the two tabulated statements above, the former gives only a rough proportion, not the exact numbers, of quotations from the Old Testament in Justin. The numbers are in or about the following:—

Exact.	Slightly variant.	Variant.
65	41	57

The above are counted from the classification in Sanday. According to this *six* would be nearer the proportion of "slightly variant" quotations. Norton calls attention to the more accurate manner of quotation in the Dialogue.

THE DIACONATE.

SIR,—Allow me to enter a protest against "An Unattached Curate's" reply to your excellent article on the Diaconate. His first grievance is that your proposal to enlist more workers would "take the bread out of the mouths" of curates. But such a complaint is simply trades-unionism in its worse form—a form which the best trades' unions have abandoned long ago. The doctrine of exclusiveness comes far worse from a clergyman than from an artisan; for trade must necessarily be self-seeking, though it need not and must not be selfish; but the Christian worker must be neither self-seeking nor selfish.

His next grievance seems to be that, although "a good preacher and reader," and although "some of his sermons have found a space in your valuable paper, yet he is still one of the great army of the unattached." But, Sir, for whose benefit has he been reading and preaching well? For the benefit of his parishioners? If so, then let him feel assured that *some* have been benefited, and thank God for it, and the Master who sent him to labour in the vineyard. But if with a view to "getting on" thereby, then let

him ponder well over what St. Paul said to Timothy about those who thought godliness a source of gain.

But his third grievance is the worst of all. It is the "wife and family" grievance. I have a wife myself, and know therefore what an invaluable help a good wife is to a clergyman; but, nevertheless, I most strongly affirm that a clergyman never looks less like a man than when he pleads, "I have a wife and family; therefore give me a living." A living is a *trust*, and for that trusteeship a wife and family is no more a qualification than a portly figure and a pair of good legs suitable for an apron and gaiters is for a bishopric.

A witty friend of mine says the Church of England will some day die of big vicarages. In sober seriousness I am more inclined to think it in more danger from those of its clergy who think the Church exists for their benefit, and not they for the Church's benefit.

A LANCASHIRE CURATE.

THE EVIDENCE OF SENSE FOR THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—It seems to me that the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, rightly understood, is quite unaffected by the testimony of our senses. The words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent on the subject are as follows:—"This conversion, then, is such that the whole 'substance' of the bread is changed by the divine power into the whole 'substance' of the body of Christ, and the whole 'substance' of the wine into the whole 'substance' of the blood of Christ" (Cat. of Trent, chapter iv., question 39).

Now here everything turns on the force of the word "substance," which is used in its old scholastic sense as "the supposed but unknown support of attributes." What the substance of bread is in this sense no one can tell, as our senses only deal with the accidents, such as colour, shape, taste, and smell. Equally, if not more mysterious, is this same word substance as applied to Christ, "substance of the body of Christ." Here again it is "the supposed but unknown support of attributes." Consequently what is said to take place in transubstantiation is this—that the supposed but unknown support of the accidents of bread and wine is removed, and its place supplied by the supposed but unknown support of the attributes of the body and blood of Christ. In both cases the substance is beyond the reach of the evidence of our senses, and the alleged change of the one imperceptible substance for the other is, of course, equally so. If this view be correct, it is not true to say that transubstantiation contradicts the evidence of our senses; it is throughout quite beyond them. I write this not as a believer in the Roman dogma, but as an impartial critic of it. It seems to me that very few Protestants understand it.

Dean Stanley says:—"The miracle, if it can be so called in any sense of that much-vexed word, consists in the transformation of one invisible object into another invisible object. The senses have neither part nor lot in the transaction on one side or the other."

So likewise Professor Thirlwall:—"One metaphysical entity is substituted for another equally beyond the grasp of the human mind."

NEBELSTREIF.

SIR,—The otherwise excellent sermon on the use of the senses in religion makes a dangerous miss in

representing the words of our Lord, "This is my body," "This is my blood," as non-metaphorical and of strictly material force, thus creating a needless and insoluble difficulty. The language of our Lord in regard to both Sacraments ought to be understood metaphorically, the water of baptism signifying the Holy Spirit, the bread and wine representing the body and blood of Christ. These sacramental elements neither contain nor convey blessing to the soul; but it pleases God to honour His own institutions, and to reward the obedient use of them by blessing faithful recipients in their deed. Not with the mouth, but in the heart we feed our Christ in both Sacraments, with thankfulness to God and with benefit to our souls.

M.

SERMONS.

SIR,—I have been a resident in a large and populous town for the last two-and-twenty years, and have rarely heard a good sermon. There is a saying that poets are born, not made, and I think this holds good with regard to orators. Of the hundreds of clergymen of the Church of England, about one in ten is possessed of preaching powers; it is, therefore, astonishing that do not make more use of the many good sermons that have been published, such as those of Keble, Canon Liddon, Dr. Vaughan, and several others. We do not expect all musicians to play nothing but their own compositions, and why should we expect greater things of clergymen?

A MARTYR.

Reviews and Notices.

"MARRIAGE WITH A WIFE'S SISTER DIRECTLY PROHIBITED BY GOD'S WORD." By the Rev. F. S. Stooke-Vaughan, M.A., Vicar of Wellington Heath. London: W. Skeffington and Son. Pp. 15.

THE contention of the writer is that *חֵתָנָה* in Deuteronomy xxvii. 23, should be so translated as to include sister-in-law as well as mother-in-law, the word meaning, generally, a near kinswoman of the wife. Then, the author argues, it will clearly appear that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is forbidden in the Bible.

But, even admitting this contention, we do not see it. For Deuteronomy xxvii. 23, says, "Cursed is he that *lieth with*, etc.," and to say, as the author does, "The Hebrew pronounces a man accursed that *marries* his 'clotheneth,' *חֵתָנָה*, is to say more than his text warrants. For *שָׁכַב*, to lie with, means what it obviously does mean, and never refers to marriage at all.

And supposing we admit even this also, then we ask the author what a "plain man" is to do when Mr. Bradlaugh asks him how it can be rational to curse a man for marrying the near kinswoman, *i.e.*, the sister of his wife, when only two chapters before he is told to marry his brother's widow? For, whatever a theologian might do, a "plain man" will be bound to admit that both are sisters-in-law, and then Mr. Bradlaugh will hew him hip and thigh.

But the primary meaning of *חֵתָנָה* is mother-in-law; and we think it ought to be so translated in Deuteronomy xxvii. 23, since there is nothing in the context to lead us to suppose it has a more extended signification.

ON Monday, the 21st ult., a novel and interesting ceremony was performed upon the site for the new church of St. Michael and All Angels, Walthamstow. The children of the congregation and of the Sunday-schools assembled to commence the foundations. The Rev. E. Ibbotson, vicar-designate, said a short office and gave an address. After the Apostles' Creed had been recited by all present, the order was given to "begin to dig," when scores of little spades were plunged into the sod, and thus the work of building the church began. A collection was made towards the fund the children are raising to provide a font for the new church.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baillie, Rev. Thomas George, Rector of Kingsland, Herefordshire.
 Barker, Rev. H. A., M.A., Curate of Kendal; Vicar of King's Pyon, Herefordshire.
 Eyton, Rev. R., Sub-Almoner to the Queen and Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge; Rector of Holy Trinity, Upper Chelsea.
 Fifth, Rev. G. W. A., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Mary's Redcliffe, Bristol; Minor Canon of Ely Cathedral.
 Hamlet, Rev. J., Curate of Burford, Oxfordshire; Vicar of Barrington, near Ilminster.
 Harper, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Selby; Vicar of Stillingfleet.
 Lethbridge, Rev. A., M.A., Vicar of Barrington, Ilminster; Rector of Shepton Beauchamp, Somerset.
 Lewis, Rev. John (St. Bee's), Incumbent of St. Anne, Hindsford.
 Oldfield, Rev. E. C., Vicar of Minchin-Hampton, Gloucester; Rector of Harthill, near Sheffield.
 Paynter, Rev. Thomas Beville, B.A., Rector of How Caple and Sollars Hope.
 Pearson, Rev. William, Vicar of Darnal, Sheffield; Vicar of Shipley, near Bradford.
 Rogers, Rev. Henry Chittenden, M.A., Rector of Wood Norton, Norfolk.
 Rolfe, Rev. George Wilkinson, B.A., Rector of Swanton Novers, Norfolk.
 Smith, Rev. Samuel, Curate of Beccles; Chaplain of the Workhouse at Norwich.
 Treherne, Rev. C. A., M.A., Minor Canon of Hereford Cathedral; Minor Canon in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle.
 Trench, Rev. Herbert Francis Chenevix, M.A., Vicar of St. John the Baptist, Tue Brook, West Derby.
 Windley, Rev. T. W., Vicar of Sneinton.
 Yarborough, Rev. J. Cooke, late Curate of Hemsworth; Organising Secretary of the Universities Mission in the Northern Province.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Attwood, Rev. George, for forty-seven years Rector of Framlingham and Saxtead, and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, at the Rectory, on the 22nd ult., aged 89.
 Bramah, Rev. Joseph West, Incumbent of Davington, Davington Priory, near Faversham, on the 26th ult.
 Gordon, Rev. F., M.A., at Biddulph Moor Rectory, Congleton on the 27th ult.
 McGrath, Canon H. W., of Ditton, Torquay, formerly Rector of Kersal, at Harrogate, suddenly, on the 27th ult., aged 81.
 Koven, Rev. Henry de, D.D., of the diocese of Connecticut, U.S.A., and a resident of Florence, Italy, at Engelberg, Switzerland, suddenly, on the 10th ult., aged 65.
 King, Rev. Alex., M.A., Oxon, Rector of the parish thirty-six years, at Sherington Rectory, Newport Pagnell, Bucks, on the 24th ult., aged 59.
 Pieritz, Rev. G. W., of Iflley-road, Oxford, on the 24th ult., aged 76.
 Read, Rev. George, M.A., T.C.D., Vicar of Brents, Faversham, Kent, at Kingstown, Ireland, after a very short illness, on the 24th ult., aged 43.
 Sparks, Rev. Edward Powell, Colonial Chaplain, fifth surviving son of the Rev. G. D. Sparks, Vicar of Undy, Newport, Mon., at Bishop's Court, Freetown, Sierra Leone, of yellow fever, on the 2nd ult., aged 29.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DOGMAS OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE REV. DR. TAIT, PAU, FRANCE.

A SERMON PREACHED IN NORWICH CATHEDRAL,
ON SUNDAY, JULY 20TH, 1884.

WE have all heard of M. Renan, one of the most accomplished French writers of the day. His "*Vie de Jésus*" has shaken the faith of many, and distressed and pained the hearts of many more. I would refer now to a leading statement in that work, and point out its fallacy; for the same fallacy is found in much of the theological literature of this most dangerous time.

The text most suitable to this important subject is found in the words of St. Paul, Romans i. 16:—

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

M. Renan speaks in the "*Vie de Jésus*," of "the beautiful morality of the Sermon on the Mount," but complains that "the Christian dogmas encumber it and weaken its power." All depends on the view which we take of Christianity. If we conceive of it as M. Renan evidently does, we must agree in his complaint. The Christian system, according to him, is one of dogma and duty combined, and both enforced by the same Divine authority. Believe as you are commanded, is the word, and do as you are directed: you shall be rewarded with immortality. He does not misrepresent in making such a statement. It is exactly the view of our holy faith which the Church of Rome inculcates, and in which he was trained for her priesthood. And it is not confined to the Roman Catholic Church: many Protestants say the same thing. It is not long since I found on the fly-leaf of a Bible intended for cheap distribution the following words printed:—*"Summary of the Christian religion.—Certain things are to be believed, and certain things are to be done; and for those who perform this two-fold duty there is the promise of everlasting life."*

But if there is no necessary connection between what we are to believe and what we are to do—if the one does not naturally lead to the other, every thinking man will say with M. Renan, "Give me the duty which I understand and approve, and relieve me of the dogma which is unintelligible." It is the very glory of Christianity that we have no cause to say so. Our ability and strength

for duty is found in what it teaches us to believe. The text of St. Paul now before us declares this in the plainest manner. He is "*not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ*." The negative implies the positive: he glories in it. And he gives his reason—"it is the power of God to salvation"—to raise from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, to make the degraded slaves of evil the devoted servants of God. This power, moreover, he goes on to say, is put forth in "*every one that believeth it*;" it is in the testimony believed that the wondrous efficacy lies hid. That testimony, as delivered by him, addressed itself to the dead formal "*Jew*" and to the abandoned licentious "*Greek*:" and in both cases it produced the same wondrous moral result. St. Paul had seen this abundantly in the most varied experience of humanity which perhaps any man ever had; and he therefore gloried in the message which he bore.

In confirmation and elucidation of these words let us now refer, with M. Renan, to the Sermon on the Mount. We have, *first*, the standard of duty which it exhibits; and, *second*, the truth concerning God which is able to elevate to this standard.

1. The standard of duty.—M. Renan eulogizes the Sermon's "beautiful morality." Well may he do so. The world had never heard, nay had never conceived, of such morality before.

It begins by demanding a right state of heart as the foundation of all moral goodness. We are to be exceedingly lowly in our own eyes—"poor in spirit." We are to have that love to God and man which will make us "mourners," in a world like this, over God's dishonour, over man's suffering and sin. We are to have that "meekness" of spirit which will forbid the rude assertion of our own rights, or fighting in our own quarrel. As the body craves refreshment and food, our spirits are to be ever "hungering and thirsting" after a larger capacity of doing God's will. We are to be "merciful" to those who injure us, and "peacemakers" among all. We are to be "pure" in our thoughts, our aims, and our objects, as under the eye of the Pure One above. For His sake we must be content to suffer; yea, in the doing of His will we must "rejoice" to suffer all that man can lay upon us. And by a heart thus right with God, and exhibited in our lives before men, we are to cause the "light" of truth and righteousness to "shine" around us on every side.

Again, we must not "do our alms to be seen of men," but for the eye of Him who is above: *He* gives liberally. Neither must we "appear to men to fast," but to "our Father which is in secret:" He knows that there is a cause. And as for "our prayers," they must not be vain repetitions, but the pouring out before Him "who seeth in secret," of our joys, our sorrows, and our cares. Neither must we live for a present

world, saying, "What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed?"—we are to cast these cares on Him who is above; He will see that, in the doing of His will, we lack nothing that is really good for us.

So much for God: now for man. It is not enough that we do not lift the hand of violence; we are not "to be angry" with our neighbour in our hearts. It is not enough that we do not assail the purity of his home; we are to hold the very thought in abhorrence. It is not enough that we do not "forswear ourselves;" we are to be men of truth, whose oath is not needed for confirmation, whose Yea is yea, and their Nay, nay. We are not to be censorious in judgment, but liberal, making all allowance for our neighbour. We are to be liberal in giving also, up to what is asked of us, and beyond it. The petitioner may be our enemy; it matters not. We are to "love our enemies, and to do good to them that hate us," and overcome their evil with that exceeding good.

Such is "the beautiful morality" of the Sermon on the Mount. Let it but be realised, and this poor world would be a paradise. But it reads like a fairy vision; we cannot help asking if man can ever be elevated to a standard so holy and so pure. He who knew what was in man, assures us that he can. Let us consider therefore—

2. The principle which has power to elevate him. An Englishman has been stolen from his home while yet an infant, before he could know the face of father and mother, or recognise brother and sister. He is carried to a land of strangers, and accustomed only to unkindness, and his heart hardens under its deadly power. The filial and fraternal feelings, lacking their natural objects, are withered up and die within him; for this fearful experience is continued for many years. Those who love and mourn for him, at last have tidings where he is, and one is sent to search for and bring him home. The effort is a success, and he reaches the shores of England. His conductor takes him to a neat and modest dwelling. "This is the house in which you were born," he says, "though you have forgotten it now." He takes him next to a chamber in that house. An old man is seated there, and a matron by his side; there are also younger persons, male and female, in the circle round. The stranger looks bewildered, and says to his conductor, "Who are these?" "This old man," he replies, "is your father; she who sits beside him is your mother; these younger persons present are your brothers and sisters." Need we describe the sequel? The first burst of astonishment over, the stranger, now no longer strange, kneels to receive a father's and mother's blessing. He clasps his sisters to his bosom; he falls on his brothers' necks and weeps. For, in that moment of glad surprise, the feelings of nature revive, and gush irresistibly forth. They had been

as good as dead, for want of their natural objects, but these objects are presented now.

It is not needful to point out whither this illustration tends. We speak and rightly, of the fall of man. Our adversary the devil, has stolen us away from God into a land of darkness, misery, and death. We have forgotten the Father who gave us our being, and forgotten also the brotherly covenant. Man has become a stranger to God, and a stranger also to his fellow. But Christ has come forth to seek and bring us back. And how, if there is any truth in Christianity, has He sought to effect this blessed object? By revealing in His holy Gospel the fatherly name of God. Even as it is written by St. John, "The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." He has declared Him indeed, at once by word and act—declared Him to be a Father.

Here then, is the leading dogma of the Sermon on the Mount—the *Fatherhood of God*. Sixteen times in this brief discourse does our Lord proclaim aloud to the listening multitudes, "Your Father which is in heaven." And there is a kindred dogma which he proclaims beside it—the *Brotherhood of Man*. Seven times in this same short sermon, in speaking of our neighbour, He calls him emphatically "thy brother."* I marvel much whether M. Renan has ever collated these texts, and if these are the dogmas from which he would deliver Christianity. The morality which he pronounces so beautiful would infallibly be swept away in the wreck, for it all comes out of the doctrine.

It is not difficult to show this. The filial heart Godward (Galatians iv. 6), the brotherly heart manward (1 John iv. 7), are the very soul of practical Christianity; every duty which can be named comes directly out of them. But if they are to be produced and preserved in existence, they must be presented with their natural objects—a Father and Brethren. And this is just the service which the blessed gospel does for us. It points to heaven, and says, "Look up! you have a Father there." It bids us also look around, while it says of every man, "*Behold your Brother!*" This is the word of which the text speaks, as the power of salvation "to every one that believeth it." For as soon as we believe it, we are in a new world. And the heart, quickened by God's word of life, turns instinctively to the blessed Objects which that word has revealed to us.

It is needless to say that of these Objects the great Father is the first. We trust in Him; we love Him; we submit ourselves in all things to His will. Our prayers cease to be a form; we kneel to receive the blessing we feel so much to need. He becomes our Counsellor in difficulty, our Comforter

* See St. Matthew v. 16, 45, 48; vi. 1, 4, 6 (twice), 8, 9, 14, 15, 18 (twice), 26, 32; vii. 16. Sixteen in all. Also v. 22 (twice), 23, 24; vii. 3, 4, 5. Seven in all.

in sorrow, our Protector in danger. That Saviour who came forth from His bosom, to make Him known to us is here our bright example. It was when they saw Him praying (Luke xi. 1) that the disciples said, "Lord, teach us to pray." Something in His whole demeanour, in His entranced expression of countenance, in His entire aspect, revealed to them what prayer was. If it was a time of danger, He manifestly was not daunted. If it was a time of difficulty, it was occasioning Him no pause. If it was a time of discouragement, that discouragement was not felt. Only one thing was felt—only one thing was realised—a Father's presence, help, and countenance. These manifestly filled the heart, and inspired its deepest devotion. The disciples desired themselves to realise all this; hence their petition. And He answered the petition by giving to them and to us that legacy of ages, "the Lord's Prayer." Most truly is it so called. It expresses the Lord's mind—that mind which is formed in us also by the revelation of the Great Father.

Such a mind cannot fail to bring with it a lowly estimate of ourselves. It cannot fail to inspire a spirit of holy mourning. It cannot fail to give reality to our fasting, and to impart a holy character to everything which our hands find to do. For what makes an act holy is its being done under the eye of God.

This filial heart, moreover, brings a brotherly heart with it. Having learned that all men are our brethren, we seek to behave ourselves toward them according to the word of St. Paul, "Be ye followers of God as dear children." His mercy is our pattern: we become merciful, too. His liberality is our pattern: we become liberal too. His long-suffering is our pattern: we learn also to suffer long, and to be kind. And loving our enemies and doing good to them that hate us, we refuse to be "overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

But let us ever remember that Christian morals owe their existence to faith in what men call the dogmas of Christianity. These dogmas, as we have seen already, are *the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man*, and, in the touching words of the German theologian, *the Sisterhood of Woman*. These constitute among them the threefold bond of love between the blessed One on high and His favoured creatures below.

How clearly these dogmas appear in St. Paul's teaching! Let us take his words as he made his way to his Thessalonian children. "Now God Himself," he prays, "*even our Father*, direct our way unto you!" He prays besides that Father to teach them "to abound in love, *one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you*" (1 Thess. iii. 9, 10). His love to them was strong as death (chap. ii. 8). Here then was Fatherhood and Brotherhood in one.

In proportion, therefore, as these verities of the Sermon on the Mount are apprehended, its lofty standard will also be exhibited. The spiritual history of England shows this statement to be true. Let us look back to the eighteenth century, when it was thought orthodox to say, "Virtue is a course of action pursued in this life for the sake of happiness in the life to come." How fared it then with Christian life and zeal? The poor were neglected; the fallen were left unpitied in their misery; the education of the young was little thought of; the claims of the outlying heathen world were utterly ignored. The Church of this nineteenth century, blessed be God, has awakened from that selfish dream. Christianity is coming to be recognised more and more every day as the loving service of a Father, and loving devotion to brethren—a going out of self that we may think of others. A Father's glory is consequently cared for, and with it the welfare of our fellows. The boundless charities of London, the efforts for good of every kind that are being organised everywhere through the provinces, the care for the young, the compassionate efforts for the heathen, all attest this to be true. Not in vain has the Church awaked to the verities of her glorious faith; they are now, as in St. Paul's day, the very power of God to save.

What we call the mysteries of the faith of Christ are but the opening out of these elementary dogmas.

There is "the mystery of the holy Incarnation." What is this mystery? The Divine assumes the human; and the human appears before us, clothed with the sonship of God. "The man, Christ Jesus," also appears before us wearing man's common flesh, and kindred to the whole human family. Here is Fatherhood and Brotherhood in one.

There is the sacred mystery of atonement. What is this mystery? The taking away the sin of the world, declaring plainly God's fatherly love to man. And there is Brotherhood as well as Fatherhood. For this Gospel is to all alike. "There is no difference; for all have sinned." And again, "there is no difference" to those who put their trust in Divine mercy: they are "justified freely by His grace."

There is the gift of life everlasting in the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. What is this mystery? Is not he who gives his own life to another in very deed a father? Everlasting life is God's own life; and He gives it to us in Christ Jesus, thereby avouching that sacred name to be His. And forasmuch as in this gift there is no restriction, and he that believeth not in it maketh God a liar, there is brotherhood as well. We are all on a par before Him.

There are Baptism and the Lord's Supper whose express designation is "holy mysteries." What are they? They are the sign-manual of Deity to

the truth of the Gospel of His love. He has told us that He loves little children, and in baptism He visibly receives them, as their own Father, into His bosom. He has told us that He has loved us, and given Himself for us; and it is His own command that we observe the Holy Eucharist, that we may keep this love in enduring memory.

But what shall we say to justification by faith? Surely that is a mystery hard to be understood. Is not a Father true to his Fatherly word? And God is in this declared to be a Father. He is always true to the confidence reposed in Him. Let those who will, see difficulty here: I find only simplicity.

Do let us be simple; the Saviour Himself has warned us that, except we receive the kingdom of God as little children, we shall in nowise enter therein. But what is simplicity? It is to believe in the love which the Great Father bears to us, and which He has Himself revealed. It is to believe in the greatness of that love—a greatness attested in the cross of the Incarnate Sufferer. It is to believe in the gift of that love—the life of God—immortality. It is to believe that, when we trust His word of mercy, He will not fail to keep it. It is to love where we have been loved, and do the will of the loving One. This is really all. Thus believing, hoping, loving, we “shall have our fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.”

THE SPIRIT OF SONSHIP.

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE CHAPEL ROYAL, DUBLIN, ON SUNDAY JUNE 1ST, 1884, BEING WHITSUNDAY.

BY THE REV. THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL, D.D.,
RECTOR OF SHANKILL (LURGAN), AND CHAPLAIN
TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT
OF IRELAND.

“Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.”—
GALATIANS iv. 6.

THE day of Pentecost is a great day in the annals of human redemption. On the first day of Pentecost, the fiftieth after the deliverance from Egypt, God descended on Mount Sinai, and gave the Law, written on the tables of stone, accompanied by lightning and thunder and the voice of words. On the last day of Pentecost, God the Holy Ghost descended accompanied by somewhat similar manifestations—a mighty rushing sound, the fire on the head of each, and the gift of tongues. In each case the senses of seeing and hearing were appealed to in proof of the presence of Deity. On the first day of Pentecost He entered into the first covenant with His people. On the last, into the second covenant—the first, with the law written on tables of stone, the second with the same law written on the fleshly tables of the heart, under which we His

people now live; and when these laws are read in our public service we pray that God will write them in our hearts. These manifestations were repeated for some time, as in the case of Cornelius, and those on whom the apostles laid their hands.

The gift of the Holy Spirit forms the great subject of our Lord's last conversation with His disciples, as detailed in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel. In this he exposes to our view the Spirit's work in the Church and in the world. As regards the world, His office is to convict men of sin, and righteousness and judgment. It is because of this, His work of conviction, that preachers of the Gospel of Christ are sustained in their work. It belongs not to intellect, to learning, to eloquence to convict, but to the Spirit alone. It is because of this that the word is never spoken in vain, for through it the Spirit convicts. It may not be on the moment the word is spoken, it may be years after that we shall see, even if we who speak shall ever see on earth, the fruit of our work.

But while the outward manifestations have ceased, and the miraculous powers have passed away, the inward work continues, as contemplated by our text—the adoption of the sinner into God's family as His child. The import of this, and in its fulness, we shall only see from examining the context. St. Paul is writing of the two covenants, which he designates, respectively, “The Law” and “Faith.” He calls the former a schoolmaster, under which the Church was to be taught and trained until the coming of the Son, when it would emerge from the bondage of the schoolmaster. He illustrates this by the case of the heir to a property, who, although heir of all, differs nothing from a slave, but is under tutors and governors until the time, as appointed by the Father, of his coming of age. He draws then the parallel, “Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage, under the elements of the world,” in other words, “the Law.” It is remarkable that he thus addresses Gentile Christians, who had not been under the Law, as if they had been. There are not *two* Churches, but one under different circumstances. The heir is not two persons, but one. So the Church, the same Church, whether composed of Jews or Gentiles, or of both, up to Christ's coming under the bondage of the Law, being under age; afterwards in the liberty of the Gospel having reached its majority. “When the fulness of the time was come,” the time when the infant Church should arrive at age—“God sent forth His Son made (born) of a woman”—and therefore human—“made (born) under (the) Law, that He might redeem them that were under (the) Law, that we (the Church) might receive the adoption of sons”—might rise out of our infant and pupillage state into our full standing in our Father's house as adult sons, and be no longer under the restraints of

law. "Wherefore," adds the Apostle, "thou"—the individual Christian—"art no more (no longer) a slave but a son." And this though no individual Galatian convert had been at any time personally a slave, under law.

When, then, Christ rose from the dead, Himself declared to be the Son of God with power by His resurrection, and ascended to the heavens in the fulness of His Sonship liberty, "God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts," not now as of old "the spirit of bondage," but the spirit whose instinctive cry is, "Abba, Father!" And this, not to make them sons, but because they were all along sons. Thus in Christ we see the Elder Brother of the spiritual family, and all the members thereof in the fulness of the liberty of the children of God.

The Galatian Christians were, it would appear, forgetting their high standing as adult sons in the Father's family, and were putting themselves under the Law, in a state of servitude. There is a propensity in human nature to go under law, in the vain hope that by *our doing* eternal life may be gained; whereas eternal life is a *gift* through Jesus Christ. Men are continually asking, "What must I *do* to obtain eternal life?" Truly if men keep the Law they shall enter into life; but this they cannot do; hence God in "the glad tidings," offers life as a free gift through Him who for them kept the law, "under which He was born," and satisfied for their transgressions. And that law, hung up as it were in the schoolroom, during their infancy, with all its sanctions, *do and live, transgress and die*, is now written in the affection of the adult child, and kept as the revelation of his Father's will, and is the very atmosphere in which alone as a loving child he can live, the spirit of sonship energising within his heart.

The Colossian Christians, though it would not appear to the same extent, were walking in the error of the Galatians. This led to the Apostle's sharp-pointed rebuke, "If ye be dead (died) with Christ from the rudiments (elements) of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances. Handle not, neither taste, neither touch (which are all to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines (teachings) of men?" Such things were elementary, "Carnal ordinances imposed until the time of reformation," human and worldly in their very nature, hence the "worldly sanctuary" of Heb. ix., suited for pupilage, "belonging to 'the outworn creed,' to the rudiments of religion, and therefore unfitted for Christian manhood" ("Speaker's Commentary," Col. ii. 8). In these there is a show, a reputation of wisdom and will-worship, a religion which man thinks out for, and imposes upon himself, but which is powerless to effect the object for which such religion is devised, and is utterly foreign to the liberty of the adult sons of God.

The spirit of sonship which ever prompts to approach God as our Father, teaches us the appropriateness of the prayer our Lord has taught us to use. It is for His children's use in their liberty, their freedom from the bondage of the Law. This is taught in the title with which we are to address God, "Father." While under the Law His people knew Him only as their Lord and Master, and so addressed Him; now, redeemed from the Law, they know Him, and approach Him, and cry to Him as "Abba, Father." Objections have been raised to this prayer as unsuitable for Christians. Strangely has it been said to belong to the Jew and not to the Christian, that is, to the child while an infant, but not when an adult; but "Father" meets, and fully meets the perverse and ignorant objection of men who are unwilling to confess day by day that they have trespasses to be forgiven. When then we use this prayer, and virtually thereby declare ourselves to be God's children, we are exercising a power for righteousness, which no law could possess. It says to us, Ever see that your actions are such as become your heavenly Father, and your position in His household. It does not become the children of a king to grovel in the dust. It does not become the sons of the King of kings to grovel in the dust of earth's pleasures and pursuits.

The great lesson which St. Paul draws from our adult sonship, is "Stand fast, therefore, in the freedom wherein Christ set us free, and be not again involved in the yoke of bondage." For no consideration whatever should God's children compromise their liberty, lest in so doing they should separate themselves from Christ, as did the Galatians, and did thereby fall from grace.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has left London. Letters of business may be addressed to the resident chaplain, Addington Park, Croydon.

At a conference of the clergy and laity in the archdeaconry of Stafford, held yesterday week at Wolverhampton, an animated discussion took place on the following proposition, "That the highest interests of the nation require the maintenance of the union of Church and State." The Rev. Charles Cox, of Enville, said that the union of Church and State interfered in various ways with the Church's proper spiritual work. It was very painful for him to contemplate that when a Bishop was appointed a real act of blasphemy was committed against the Holy Spirit. Canon Lonsdale, a member of the Chapter, stated that he declined to invoke the Holy Spirit when Bishop MacLagan was chosen. Prebendary Grier, of Rugeley, argued that by its union with the State the Church was thwarted, humiliated, opposed, and robbed of many of her privileges. He, therefore, moved the previous question. The Rev. Charles Maud, of Wilnecote, seconded the amendment, but, upon a division, it was lost by a large majority. The proposition in favour of the union was then put and carried, with a few dissentients.—*Manchester Guardian*.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1884.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

CANON LIDDON'S paragraph on the bread and wine in the Holy Communion was sure to lead to discussion. We were glad to insert the remarks upon it of two esteemed correspondents, and we now venture to add our own contribution to the argument of a question, which is undoubtedly the central point of difference between those Christians who are sacerdotalists and those who are not. Now, Canon Liddon starts, like all theologians of his school, from the assumption that to resolve our Lord's words ("This is my body," "This is my blood") into metaphor, is to take unworthy liberty with His language. On what possible ground can the Canon make this statement? The whole teaching of Jesus Christ was conveyed in the form of metaphor (Matt. xiii. 34); the employment of figurative language was one of His most striking characteristics, and He was exceedingly displeased when His scholars were dull enough to interpret such language literally (Mark viii. 14-21). We must be permitted to think that Canon Liddon, and all his school, repeat this error of the first twelve disciples, and that here, as elsewhere, our Saviour intended His language to be taken as a metaphor, and that this, and not the other, is the plain sense of the words of Christ. The practical effect of the Canon's doctrine is precisely the same as that of the Roman one: it establishes an idol, and justifies an idolatry. He says "that these elements remaining in their natural substances are yet veiled channels of the sacred Presence which is plainly, in whatever sense, identified with them by the very words of Christ." Thus to him, as to the members of the council of Trent, the material object is identified with, is, and contains, the Deity; and is therefore, as a necessary consequence, a legitimate object of divine worship. If this view prevails among the clergy at St. Paul's, there is no wonder that they should be zealous to introduce the *Corpus Christi* ceremonial. Our correspondent Nebelstreif, whom we felicitate on his admirable selection of a *nom de plume*, confines his observations to the question whether the transformation of one "supposed but unknown support of

the attributes," or accidents, of an object into another contradicts the evidence of our senses, and he holds that our senses bear no evidence whatever on the subject. All this appears to be a very long way up *in nubibus*, and, if it had no connection with the world of real life, we would not trouble ourselves any further with attempting to grasp so impalpable a streak of cloud. But the misfortune is, that the identification of the piece of bread with Deity converts that material object into an idol; and, when the dogma of the exclusive power of the priesthood to create the idol has been superadded, it serves as a foundation for the assumption by that priesthood of a discretionary power over the bestowal of God's grace, and over the salvation of man. And, in this respect, Canon Liddon's identification of the bread with the Deity seems to us to form quite as strong a basis for idolatry and for priestcraft, as the fully developed scholastic theory which has been erected into a dogma by the Church of Rome. We, for our part, declare against all such interpretations. Christ's words were, in this, as in all other similar cases, metaphorical, nor is there anything done unworthy of Him, when we interpret His own words according to the rules which He Himself has given.

DIOCESAN SYNODS.

IN a recent article we referred to the great importance of clerical reading and study, by the fact that the Bishop of Lichfield had inaugurated in his diocese a new order called "The Pastoral Order of the Holy Spirit," the rules of which bind its members to give a certain amount of time each day to the study of divinity. We have now to notice another move of the same Right Reverend prelate, and that is the calling together of a Diocesan Synod. In doing this he is but following the example of the dioceses of Exeter, Oxford, and Lincoln. There is no doubt that the calling together of such a synod will be looked upon with distrust and suspicion by some; but those who have watched the actions of the Bishop of Lichfield during the episcopate, following as he did such a remarkable man as Bishop Selwyn, and also during the time that he was the vicar of two important London parishes, are well aware that his great object is to promote measures which will make the Church acceptable to the people, as, for instance, his recent proposal to allow laymen to preach in consecrated buildings at other times than those used for the ordinary services; and so if anything can be done to bring men nearer to Christ, all Christian men ought to gladly welcome the efforts made to attain that object. This synod did not busy itself with the burning questions of the day—the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, the Patronage or the Cemeteries Bill; nor yet simply to

talk and pass resolutions which are often worth little or nothing ; but the question which occupied the attention of the clergy thus assembled was the evangelization of the masses—a truly important subject. When we consider the number of people in our large towns who never go to any place of worship, but simply lounge about, and in the evening wait with eager eyes for the opening of the doors of the public-house, we must admit that there exists an evil which needs a remedy. And not only in large towns does this evil exist, but also in country parishes of varying size ; and if anything can be done, whether brought about through the calling together of Diocesan Synods, Convocations, Church congresses or diocesan conferences all Churchmen should gladly welcome the effort. There is another reason why this subject should have been chosen at the Lichfield Synod. Since the separation of the See, and the formation of the new diocese of Southwell, there still remains a large and densely populated part of the country in the diocese of Lichfield. From the confines of Birmingham to the borders of Wales does the diocese extend, with almost every alternation of society that can exist—the ironworkers in the black country, the miners in Staffordshire and Shropshire, the potters in North Staffordshire, and the agricultural labourers. And the Church must reach these men, congregated in densely populated towns, and in villages overgrown with people drawn from various parts in consequence of the opening out of some colliery, or the erection of some ironworks, the spiritual provision for whom is quite inadequate to the demand. If the Church does not put forth all her energies and bring out her latent powers to reach these men, it will be a golden opportunity lost never to be recovered. There is no surer means of Church defence than to make the Church, “the Church of the people,” to take a lively and keen interest in all that pertains to them, to give to them a true manly religion, and to show that by joining the Church of Christ, and fighting manfully under His banner, they do not lose their self-respect, and to lead them on by plain speaking, and not by the repetition of mere platitudes and weak aimless sentimentalism. There was one element in the synod which we rather regret, and that was the absence of the laity. The bishop of a diocese has plenty of opportunities, if he likes to use them, of getting to know the feelings and wishes of the laity ; but we have always felt that, in matters affecting the welfare of the Church, it would be well to have a certain element of the communicant laity present, and therefore we are glad to see that at the recent meeting of the Southern Convocation it was proposed that there should be a laymen’s house, and that the laity should discuss questions undeterred by the presence of the clergy. In all efforts which are proposed for the good of the Church there will be some who will not be satisfied ; but we believe

that it would be a great boon to the Church of England if more of our bishops would but call their clergy together, whether it be in diocesan synods or in other meetings,—anything rather than the dull, stereotyped visitations. If this could be done, and there is no reason why it should not, it would be a sure means of helping forward the work of God, and many a parochial clergyman would return home with his heart gladdened by what he had seen and heard.



OUR LORD’S LAST WORDS ON THE CROSS.

(Communicated.)

WHEN a number of credible witnesses give varying accounts of the same event, varying in even the uncommon case when they have all witnessed the whole of the circumstances of the transaction which they narrate, it requires some discrimination and skill in the examination of evidence to put together the several depositions so as to construct a complete history. Memories differ, powers of observation differ, both habitual and as affected by the natural senses and their degree of perfection in different persons. Very frequently flat contradictions occur, as when a circumstance stated by one is denied by another to be possible, because he (that other) did not see or hear it. Where there is anything of this kind, it is almost always right to accept, rather than reject, a statement of positiveness, in preference to a negative ; the matter being intrinsically probable, and the witness worthy of reliance. On the whole, addition is more likely to lead to a correct result than subtraction.

A man is attended on his death-bed by three persons, whom his friend questions with interest and minuteness on the circumstances of the decease. All three agree that the sick man’s mind remained clear to the last moment, and unexcited ; and they agree that his death occurred at a specific hour and minute. The friend asks them separately what were his last words. The nurse says, “He talked about things long ago that I do not know anything of.” The wife says, “The last word he said was ‘Farewell,’ a few minutes before the end.” The physician says, “He said, ‘Lord, receive me,’ and almost instantly expired quietly.” These accounts appear utterly inconsistent with one another, and would certainly puzzle many persons ; but a very few questions put to the witnesses will probably remove all difficulty and all real contradiction. The nurse was standing at the fireplace, out of hearing ; the wife was kneeling, her face covered with her hands ; and, on being asked again, remembers that her husband had moaned just before he breathed his very last ; while the physician, watch in hand, was stooping with his head close to the deceased, and to the more searching question replies that the words were spoken very low and indistinctly. So that the sum of the three narratives, two of them being incorrect, or at least inexact, gives a more perfect history than that account taken alone which was literally and minutely true.

There are four, or more properly three, narratives of our Saviour’s death ; for Matthew and Mark give substantially, even particularly, the same. According to them, our Lord’s last words were an expression as of forsaken agony ; and they add, that at the moment of death He again cried with a loud voice, without

mentioning whether this cry was inarticulate or of words. St. Luke fills in the hiatus, he being, as a historian, a more minute searcher into particulars than the other two Synoptics. The last words of our Lord were, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." It is probable that He spoke them with that want of vocal clearness which is not unnatural to one at the point of death.

If John's account appears different,—I say, appears, for it is not contradictory—he tells what were our Lord's penultimate words, as Luke does his ultimate; while St. Luke is exact in particulars, the beloved disciple is the recorder of the words of our Lord which were of important pregnancy,—and this by disposition and also by design,—“It is finished; and He bowed His head and gave up the ghost,”—this does not of necessity, or at all, exclude the fact that our Lord spoke certain other words afterwards; certainly afterwards, as they are evidently those of one who spoke no more. But the interest is greater of the penultimate than of the last utterance, because that had a meaning beyond what lay on the surface. What was that meaning?

Some reply that our Saviour meant nothing but that His life was ended, as any man sentenced to death might say when he lays his head on the block. Others say that He meant that His work—the work of the redemption of the world—was completed. If we cannot be certain what our Saviour did intend to convey, we can be certain what the witness John understood that he intended to convey. “After this, Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished (*ὅτι πάντα ἤδη τετέλεσται*), that the Scripture might be fulfilled (*τελειωθῇ*), saith, I thirst. . . . When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, He said, It is finished” (*Τετέλεσται*). By using the same word, in reference to the accomplishment of all things, that our Lord used, and by using a derivative word, and not the ordinary *πληρωθῇ*, in reference to the accomplishment of the Scriptures, St. John shows that he understood *τετέλεσται* to mean that the prophecies concerning our Lord's death were then accomplished. Owing to the abundance of the English language in synonyms, or in quasi-synonyms, it is the habit of translators from those languages which are poorer to render derivatives by words which are not derivative, but approximately synonymous. King James's translators offend in this more than the revisers, but even of them it is said that they are

Strong in Greek,
In English weak.

To preserve the fulness of the sense of St. John's words, we ought to read, “After this Jesus, knowing that all was already (or now) accomplished, that the Scripture might become accomplished, said, I thirst.” It not necessary to use “accomplished;” “perfected,” “completed,” or “fulfilled” would be also correct; but it is necessary to use whichever word we use throughout, giving in the second use of it the middle sense or inflection.

The above appears to me demonstrative. The theological interest of the subject arises from the use to which our Saviour's last words are being constantly put when their application is supposed to be to His work of redemption. It is very common to hear “the finished work of Christ” spoken of, those who use that phrase generally meaning by it that, once redemption through our Lord's sacrifice being purchased, nothing more remains to be done towards the

putting away sin; or if they do not mean this, they must explain away—whittle down—what they say. It ought to be a sufficient objection to the phrase that it is not in the Bible, not to speak of the view of redemption which it involves being a perverted view. That work was not completed when our Lord gave up the ghost. If He had not gained the victory over Satan and death by rising again, Satan and death had gained the victory over Him. Also, the defined and sharp separation which is constantly made between the redemption of the world in our Lord's sacrifice and its recovery from the power of evil through the operation of His Spirit, constant and efficacious, is a separation which the Bible does the reverse of sanctioning. The Bible treats of what Christ has done, and of what His Spirit is doing, as a whole; and this is the only true aspect, and the only aspect under which a science of theology is possible.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DR. POORE ON BURIAL.

SIR,—It is gratifying to find scientific men, like Dr. George Vivian Poore, standing up for the ancient form of burial in the earth at a time when other men of science are loud in advocacy of cremation—a mode of treating the dead of a purely pagan character, and conflicting with the practice of Christians in all ages. The Bishop of Lincoln avers, in treating of this subject, that “burial was regarded as a triumph of Christianity in extinguishing the flames of funeral piles which once blazed throughout the Roman empire.” The history of the Christian Church testifies how the early Christians, and their successors in all ages, jealously guarded this right of committing the departed to the earth. In the *Chronique dite de Nestor, traduite sur le Texte Slavon-Russe, par Louis Léger*, recently issued in Paris, we are assured how faithfully the Scandinavians adhered to the Christian policy. Although references are made to cremation, nevertheless abundant proofs are here given that interment was the Christian usage, and that the abandonment of the fiery process of extinction was a Christian distinction. Here follows a passage in proof:—“In Livonia, where heathenism lingered longer than in almost any part of Europe, there is a solemn deed of contract (dated A.D. 1249) entered into between the converts and the Brethren of the Holy Cross, by which the former became bound for themselves and their heirs never again to burn their dead, but to bury them in the cemeteries attached to the churches.”

The chapter on Burial in Dr. Poore's recently published brochure, “Our Duty in relation to Health,” and which forms one of the hand-books of the International Health Exhibition, is replete with useful matter. The author is one of the New School, is quite in unison with Mr. Seymour Haden, and warmly commends the earth-to-earth method of sepulture, which for several years has been adopted at the London Necropolis, Surrey. Nature, it is very properly averred, laughs at strong coffins, sarcophagi, brick vaults, or Egyptian pyramids, and, indeed, whatever tends to hinder the natural process of resolution. When man essays to thwart Nature, and, as it were, cheat her out of her rights, a ready Nemesis is at

hand, inasmuch as "the dead body becomes a nuisance and a danger." Dr. Poore inveighs against certain of the cemetery companies whose object is "to pack the dead as close as possible, and thereby pay a good dividend." Undertakers, too, have meted out to them a deserved share of censure. They are not to be regarded as promoters of sanitary burial. But as grief-stricken households too often leave all the mortuary arrangements to such incompetent persons, "who derive a profit which is exactly proportioned to the degree in which nature's work is hindered." Dr. Poore pronounces our present mode of burial "disgusting," and, I conceive, with ample reason. He affirms that if the body be laid in the earth, and if the earth come into actual contact with the body, its gradual resolution into its ultimate elements is effected quickly and without offence. No wooden coffin, no matter how slight, will allow of this consummation. It must necessarily be of a material that, while strong enough to bear a certain weight, must also have the property of speedily dissolving when in contact with the soil, like, for example, the patent earth-to-earth coffin used at Woking Cemetery. The author of this timely treatise remarks, "If we wish a dead body to be decently turned again to the condition of inorganic matter, we must actually commit the body 'to the earth,' and we must take care that the expressive language of our Burial Service is not turned to a mockery and a mere figure of speech." Dr. Poore is opposed to the employment of tombstones, and, to further burials in Westminster Abbey. Referring to the late President of the Royal Society (who died of typhoid fever), and whose remains were interred in this venerable minster, he caustically observes, "A President of the Royal Society who had done so much to encourage the reverent study of the laws of nature should at least have been laid where nature's laws could pursue their course without even the semblance of opposition." Cemeteries, according to the author, should invariably be well planted with trees and shrubs, because, where earth-to-earth burial is properly carried out, the process of resolution becomes quickened, besides "the roots find their way to the organic matter, and in due time green leaves and fragrant blossoms speak to us in no uncertain language of a joyful resurrection." CLERICUS.

THE DIACONATE.

SIR,—I am afraid "A Lancashire Curate" has misunderstood the object of my letter upon the above subject. I would be sorry to classify curates among trade unionists, but perhaps after all it is a pity there is not more unity amongst curates and clergy in general, in place of a great deal of jealousy, which injures, in place of advancing, the great cause we should all have in view, viz., the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. I am indeed thankful for the privilege I have had of addressing many congregations, where I have reason to know my sermons have been appreciated, and, I think, have been blessed by the Holy Spirit, without whose blessing all our preaching will be in vain. I am thankful I have a good wife, and nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see her presiding over a parish as my co-helper, in place of now being, like myself, without any parochial work to do.

I have often thought what a grand thing it would be if a list of unattached curates was kept at the

registry office of each diocese, and, upon a vacancy in any parish, application were made there for a suitable assistant whom the Bishop could recommend. If this were adopted, there would be fewer unemployed curates: they could be called in, like officers in the army, to fill up vacancies; and this would avoid a vast deal of trouble and expense to many a poor curate, as well as endless correspondence to vicars, which in many cases ends in nothing. But, by all means, provide for the great army of unattached curates who are worthy of positions, before you add to their number, which in the long run increases the difficulty of their obtaining position tenfold. I heard of 110 applications for one curacy last week.

AN UNATTACHED CURATE.

OUR LORD'S VERNACULAR LANGUAGE.

SIR,—I perceive that, in most writings of modern times bearing on the subject, it is assumed that our Lord spoke habitually or exclusively Aramaic, and that, consequently, in the Gospels we have only a translation of His words. May I ask some of your more learned contributors what proofs exist of this being the case?

Some years ago (1843) a new edition was brought out of Diodati's work, *De Christo Græce loquente Exercitatio*; and quite recently Dr. Roberts published an elaborate work on the same subject. But I observe that Renan and others of his school quietly ignore all their arguments, and assume, as an unquestionable fact, that Christ and His Apostles did not speak Greek. I should like to know what proofs for this assumption exist? R. P. C.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.—EVIDENCE OF THE SENSES.

SIR,—No doubt "Nebelstrief" is quite right. Our senses cannot judge of the presence, or absence, of substance, abstracted from its accidents, if such a thing there be. That is not the real objection to the Romish doctrine. The true objection is that it makes it impossible for God to prove by miracles the mission of His Son or of any other prophet. How can Our Lord's resurrection be proved, if the Apostles' senses, dealing alone with the accidents of His body, could not be sure that it was a real body which they handled, much less that that body was the same with which they were conversant with in His lifetime? Nothing can be proved by means of our sight, hearing, handling, &c., if substance can exist separate from its accidents. This forces Romanists to hang on the one peg, the infallible voice of the present Church or interpreting priesthood, though even that voice cannot carry certainty without doubt to my mind, unless I am miraculously preserved from mistake. Our Lord was infallible, yet His hearers misunderstood Him.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

THE Rev. V. S. S. Coles, rector of Shepton Beauchamp, writes that the announcement in our last issue of the appointment to his parish and to Barrington was premature. The announcement was taken from another paper.

Reviews and Notices.

"WHO WAS THIS JOHN WESLEY? A QUESTION FOR THE WESLEYANS." Compiled by the Rev. T. A. CARR, LL.D., Incumbent of Whitechurch, Co. Dublin. Pp. 8.

THIS little pamphlet, one of a series of CHURCH TRACTS, will be found interesting to many of our readers. It contains several well-selected extracts from John Wesley's journal, showing that his attachment to the Church of England and her doctrines continued all his life, and that he enjoyed the favour of bishops and clergy; and points out that it is only one of many popular delusions to suppose that John Wesley was driven out of the Church of England. It is published at the office of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, Dublin, at the low price of 2d.

"LIFE: IS IT WORTH LIVING?" By the Rev. J. M. Lang, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 207.

ON page 5 the author says, "A son of God asking, 'Is life worth living?'—it is impossible. He has the witness in himself" thus admirably answering the only thing objectionable in his book—its title. There is no clearer proof of the unreality of much of the controversy of the present day than the fact that anyone should profess to argue, and should find listeners for his argument, whether or not life is worth living. Why not argue the question, "Should fire burn?" It *does* burn, and there's an end of it; just as we have to live our lives, and there's an end of that, too, unless we were genuine pessimists, in which case we should commit suicide; the insincerity and unreality of the creed of Schopenhauer and his followers is amply proved by the mere fact that they don't commit suicide. And it is never worth while arguing against pretenders. But having made this one objection to Dr. Lang's book, we have nothing but praise for it afterwards. He divides his book into three parts, examining, first, theories—rightly does he call them theories—of life whose standard is one of feeling, under which he examines optimism and pessimism; secondly, theories which determine the worth of life by the experience of happiness, under which he examines Hedonism; and, thirdly, theories which determine the worth of life by a moral standard, by the capability of realising a permanent inward blessedness. Very much the best part of the book is this third section. As soon as it begins, the style of the book, good throughout, sensibly improves; and the author seems to rouse himself from the hollowness of a contest with unrealities to the earnestness of a battle for life. Dr. Lang clearly feels, and clearly shows that he feels, Christianity no vain thing, but our life,—quite worth doing battle for, and by no means to be compromised. Thus he nails down the author of "Natural Religion" to the fact that his "admiration," by which we are to live, in overlooking the fact of sin and the need of salvation therefrom, is a mere diletante religion. Yet while he admits no compromise with antichristian system, he clearly sees the enormous harm which has been done to Christianity by the dogmatism of theologians, who have put their petty schemes in the place of a true, vital, practical Christianity. He does not claim for Christianity that it can do what it never professes to do, viz., to explain

all the difficulties connected with the order of the universe. Yet he shows how often Christianity does throw light on many difficulties, and shows also how many of the objections of Dr. Herbert Spencer, Prof. Huxley, and J. S. Mill are purely of their own creating, since they will not be at the trouble to see exactly what Christ really did say, but answer instead either something He did not say, or else the theories of theologians. And, in a word, all this part of the book is so good that we can honestly say it would have been better that it should have been longer.

WHITHER?

I WILL not set my weak and puny brain
To read the riddle, "How I came to be?"
Or "Where I go?" I cannot grasp the train
Of countless causes and effects. Ah me!
The problem all unsolved for ever must remain,
My vapid theories and I both swamped in Death's deep sea.

"Whence came I" matters little. I am here,
Whether created or evolved from ape.
But "whither go I" is a question dear
To brainful minds, to dabble in, and shape
Their bald, conceited speculations, which are mere
Nibbling attempts to grasp a law whose end they would escape.

And since I know not whither I shall go,
When from Life's bondage Death shall set me free,
Doubtless shall be extinct, and cease to know,
Or feel,—or think,—yea, truly, cease to be—
Die like a dog—consume away like melting snow,
Be lost like wretched bark drifting upon a boundless sea.

O hideous solution! Wretched lot!
Illogical as groundless. Of all schemes,
This fool's attempt to cut the Gordian knot
To me seems madder than the maddest dreams.
O great Unknown! now grant me faith, and let me not
Dishonour Thee, and cumber science with such soulless themes!

Why, knowing not, cries man that "all is lost"?
Sure he disquieteth himself in vain!
Lean creed! which thus annihilates God's host,
E'en the agnostic's blank were greater gain.
Yet now one thought revives, which ever cheers me most—
That God, who sent me forth from Him, will take me back again.

ARTHUR H. POWELL, M.A.

THE Bishop of St. Asaph will be absent from his palace during the month of August. His lordship desires that any communications on diocesan matters be addressed during his absence to his secretary, Diocesan Registry, St. Asaph.

THE Bishop of Rochester, who will be the representative of the English prelates at the conference of the American bishops, which is to be held at New York, about the middle of the current month, will make a somewhat longer stay than was originally intended, and will not return until October. During his absence the Bishop of Dover will perform the Episcopal duties of the diocese.

EARL FITZWILLIAM, chairman of the Wakefield Bishopric Committee, has received from the new Bishop of Ripon an intimation of his approval of

the scheme for founding the new see, and a promise of his cordial co-operation. The Bishop has appointed the Rev. Samuel Bickersteth as his private, and not, as it has been generally reported, as his domestic chaplain. Mr. Bickersteth is the son of the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, of Hampstead, and a cousin of the late Bishop.

OAKHAM SCHOOL TERCENTENARY.—The Head Master (the Rev. E. Vere Hodge, M.A.) announced that an old boy in the room had authorised him to say that he would give two prizes of £10 for the best work on "The British Empire: Geographical, Social, and Political, with special reference to the Dominion of Canada." At the conclusion of the speeches the prizes were presented to the boys by Lord Burghley as follows:—Christmas: Form VI., Turner; Form V., Field; Form IV., Fishbourne; Form III., Forster; Form II., Price i.; Form I., Kerr. Special prizes: English Essay, Swift; history, i. Turner, ii. Field; geography, Lovegrove. Midsummer: Form VI., classics, Turner and Swift; mathematics, Turner; French, Turner. Form V., classics, Bramall; mathematics, Turner; French, Turner. Form V., classics, Bramall; mathematics, Luard; modern languages, Adlington; science, Viener. Form IV., classics, Bitten; mathematics, Forster. Form III., classics, Wright; mathematics, Taylor; French, Gorst. Form II., 1st prize, Howard; 2nd Prize, Kerr. Form I., Norman, Tilley, æq.; music, Douglass i.; drawing, Robinson i.; writing i., Taylor; writing ii., Bailey 2. Honour List, 1883-84.—Open Scholarship, Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Swift; Open Scholarship, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, Marriott; Johnson Exhibition, St. John's College, Cambridge, Barraclough; Honours, Natural Science Tripós, Whitby. Oxford and Cambridge Local Board Examination Certificates, 1883.—Swift (with distinction in Latin and French), Turner, Chapman i., Marriott, James, Hawthorn i., Barraclough i.

SUNDAY, 20th July (writes a correspondent of the *Guardian*), will long be remembered by the parishioners of Bryngwyn, Monmouthshire, as a day of great interest for them, being that on which their beloved pastor, the Ven. Archdeacon Crawley, completed the fiftieth year of his incumbency of that parish, for forty years of which period he has also held the office of Archdeacon of Monmouth. During this time, owing mainly to his own unwearied activity, he has been permitted to witness the restoration of nine-tenths of the churches within the archdeaconry, and has succeeded, by his uniform kindly courtesy and his readiness at all times to aid them in their difficulties, in winning the esteem and respect of all the clergy and laity within its borders. For some years, owing to a severe attack of bronchitis, from the effects of which he has never wholly recovered, the Ven. Archdeacon has been incapacitated for much of the active work to which, while strength was given him, he devoted himself with so much earnestness; but he is still able to hold his annual visitations, and to assist with his wise and fatherly counsel clergy and laity alike. The writer of this brief record concludes it with the following simple, affecting words, which it was his privilege to listen to in Bryngwyn Church, and which he thinks will not be uninteresting to our readers:—"My dear brethren, I had fondly hoped to be able to preach to you once again to-day. I had even chosen a text for my sermon, which was to have been taken from 1 Cor. ii. 2, 'I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and

Him crucified.' But my breath is too short, and I must content myself by telling you why I especially wished to preach to you on this occasion. It was because it is just *fifty years* since I began my ministry among you, and, though I am conscious of many failings and shortcomings in fulfilling it (for the pardon of which I trust in the mercy of God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, His Son), yet have they been happy years, and besides all else that have been owing to the loving kindness of our God, much has been due to the kindness and respect which I have uniformly received from my parishioners. I will only add that I shall still pray for you and take the same interest in your welfare, both spiritual and temporal, as before, though I am no longer able to go in and out among you. I think myself very fortunate in having our Bishop with us, and I therefore the less regret my own inability to preach to you.

OUR announcement last week of the death of the Rev. G. W. Pieritz, at the age of seventy-six, on the 24th ult., was no doubt read with deep regret by many Oxford men. At the age of eighteen Mr. Pieritz was a rabbi, and continued for some years to act in that capacity, but having been converted to the Christian faith he was baptised in the year 1834, the King of Prussia and the historian Neander acting as his sponsors. The *Oxford Times* says he was largely instrumental in influencing his Majesty to take the steps which he did with reference to the Jerusalem Bishopric, although he was eventually quite out of harmony with the working of that mission. He was himself a missionary at Jerusalem, as a layman, from 1838 to 1840. He then came to England, and graduated at Caius College, Cambridge, and was ordained in 1846 perpetual curate of Stanningly. The four years following his marriage, from 1847 to 1851, he spent as a missionary in India. On his return to England, for several years he took pupils at Cambridge, until he was presented to the living of Hardwicke, in 1865. This he resigned in 1870, and for the last fourteen years he has lived at Cowley St. John, teaching Hebrew. His death took place at Pitney, in Somersetshire. He had gone there for several weeks of last year, and the vicar was anxious to secure his services a second time. He and Mrs. Pieritz had been dining with a friend, and Mrs. Pieritz had gone home to the vicarage early, being tired after a long drive. He said there was no need to send the carriage for him, he could walk. When midnight came, Mrs. and Miss Pieritz were anxious at his non-appearance. The coachman was sent to inquire if anything was amiss. He went to Mr. Paul's house, where they had dined, and found his master had left a long time ago. That gentleman therefore sent a servant with a lantern, that the two messengers might see if any trace was to be found. On getting near the vicarage, they discovered the body fallen against the hedge. Life was entirely extinct. Indeed, he had probably died before he fell. His death was caused by fatty degeneration of the heart. He was buried in the churchyard of Cowley St. John. Mr. Pieritz was the author of a singularly suggestive essay, "The Gospels from the Rabbinical Point of View;" and the *Oxford Times* says that at the time of his death he was engaged on a treatise replying to many of the statements of Professor Robertson Smith with reference to the Old Testament. One of the chapters contains an interesting account of his conversion to Christianity, and of the reasons which led him to seek admission to the English Church.

CHURCH PATRONAGE.—The following is the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the two Bills introduced by Mr. E. Leatham and Mr. Edward Stanhope :—

"Your committee have considered the Bills referred to them, but having come to the conclusion that the session is too far advanced for a Bill to be passed this session, have agreed to the following resolutions :—

"That the sale of next presentations be prohibited.

"That resignation bonds be abolished.

"That donatives be turned into presentative benefices.

"That if a fair method of compensation be adopted, the sale of advowsons be prohibited, with certain limitations.

"That the limitations shall be such as not to prevent the sale to—

"(1) Purchasers having a proprietary interest in the same or an adjoining parish, or in both parishes, of not less annual value than the income of the living in question.

"(2) Some public patron or set of trustees not having power of sale.

"(3) The Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty Board under the provisions hereinafter contained.

"That the price to be paid for advowsons by Queen Anne's Bounty Board shall be matter for negotiation between the vendor and the board, and shall be determined, if necessary, by arbitration, but shall in no case exceed five times the net annual value of the benefice.

"That the price thus paid by Queen Anne's Bounty Board, with interest, be a charge upon such benefices after the next avoidance, payable in not less than thirty annual instalments, or be defrayed from the funds that may be at the disposal of Queen Anne's Bounty Board.

"That Queen Anne's Bounty Board have power to resell any advowson that they may have purchased to any purchaser qualified as aforesaid.

"That it be no longer necessary for a public patron to obtain a licence in mortmain to enable him to acquire an advowson.

"That in place of the present declaration against simony, declarations be substituted, to be made by the clerk and the patron, that they have not committed certain specific acts forbidden by law.

"That no sales of patronage be valid unless the instrument effecting them be registered in the diocesan registry.

"That in all cases, before the institution of a presentee to a living, public notice be given to the parishioners, and the parishioners shall have sufficient opportunity of submitting to the Bishop any objections felt within the said parish to the appointment of the presentee.

"That if a certain number of the parishioners object to the presentee on the grounds of physical or mental incapacity or moral delinquency, the Bishop may, after inquiry (if he think fit) by a commission, refuse to institute the presentee.

"That the power of Bishops to refuse to institute a presentee on the ground of unfitness in point of age, or want of proper testimonials, be made clear.

"That patronage boards, partly composed of laymen, be established in every diocese, with power to purchase and hold advowsons and present to benefices,

"That the churchwardens of any parish of which a benefice is vacant shall be members of such patronage board *pro hac vice*.

"That the patronage of any living purchased by Queen Anne's Bounty Board as aforesaid be vested in the Diocesan Patronage Board."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beebe, Rev. H. T., Vicar of Yeovil.

Blackmore, Rev. J. C., Rector of Cley-next-the-Sea; Rector of Kelling-with-Salthouse.

Bourne, Rev. Alfred Ernest, B.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Battersea.

Brierley, Rev. Phillip Henry, Surrogate.

Clemens, Rev. Alfred R., Curate of St. Botolph, Aldersgate; Chaplain and Head Master of the London Orphan Asylum, Watford.

English, Rev. George, Rector of Combe Hay.

Estcourt, Rev. Edmund Walter, M.A., Rector of Long Newton, Wilts.

Hodgson, Rev. Francis H., Vicar of Abbots Langley; Rural Dean of Watford Deanery.

Holme, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of Crewkerne.

Hutchinson, Rev. Septimus, Curate of St. Philemon's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, Vicar of All Saints', Preston.

Lane, Rev. C. Arthur, Curate of St. George's, Campden-hill; Rector of All Saints' Church, Winnipeg.

Lee, Rev. Augustus Charles, Vicar of Lugwardine.

Mayne, Rev. J., Vicar of St. Catherine's, Gloucester, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

Moon, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Owersby with Kirkby and Osgodby.

Rock, Rev. Edward Dennis, B.A., Vicar of Sutton, Suffolk.

Sharp, Rev. H. I., M.A., Vicar of Swavesey; Rector of Little Downham.

Shimield, Rev. W. H., Rector of Wendy; Association Secretary of the South American Missionary Society for the Dioceses of Ely, Norwich, and St. Albans.

Smith, Rev. Henry E., Curate of Eakring, Newark-on-Trent; Incumbent of All Saints' Church, Weston, near Crewe.

Spencer, Rev. J. L., M.A., Curate of Wem; Vicar of Pelsall.

Stansfeld, Rev. John Birkbeck Evelyn, M.A., Rector of Preston, Rutland.

Westbrook, Rev. Francis Stephen, M.A., Chaplain H. M. Prison, Nottingham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Field, Rev. John, M.A., J.P., for twenty-six years Rector of West Rounton, at his residence, Wenlock-terrace, York, on the 31st ult., aged 71.

Glanville, Rev. James Gordon, for nearly twenty-four years Vicar of Ellingham, Hants, at Weymouth, on the 1st inst., aged 72.

Hale, Rev. Phillip, B.A., Curate of Staverton, Northamptonshire, at 24, Torrington-square, on the 3rd inst., aged 67.

Johnson, Rev. William, at No. 19, East Southernhay, Exeter, on the 31st ult., aged 44.

McGrath, Rev. H. W., M.A., Honorary Canon of Manchester, and late Rector of St. Paul's, Kersal, Manchester, at Harrogate, on the 27th ult., aged 81.

Ogle, Rev. William Pomeroy, third son of the Rev. W. R. Ogle, of Bishop's Teignton, at Brentwood, on the 1st inst., aged 25.

Proctor, Rev. A., formerly Vicar of Alnwinton-with-Holystone, 1833-77, and Vicar of Doddington, 1877-1884, suddenly, at Doddington Glebe, Alnwick, on the 29th ult., aged 81.

Spooner, Rev. Isaac, M.A., for more than thirty-six years Vicar of Edgbaston, at Edgbaston Vicarage, after a few hours' illness, on the 26th ult., in his 76th year.

Webster, Rev. George Dennis, B.A., Parish Priest of Pretoria, and Chaplain to the Bishop, at Pretoria, on the 12th June, aged 36.

Witts, Rev. William Frederick, Vicar of Ringwood, and late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, at Ringwood Vicarage, on the 31st ult., aged 66.



The Church of England Pulpit.

OAKHAM SCHOOL TERCENTENARY.

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF
HEREFORD.

SERMON PREACHED IN OAKHAM PARISH CHURCH
AT THE TERCENTENARY COMMEMORATION OF
ITS SCHOOL, ON TUESDAY, JULY 29TH, 1884.

“And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth. I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labour: other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours.”—*St. JOHN* iv. 37, 38.

I REALLY find it hard to give utterance to the thoughts which crowd upon my mind in connection with this Church and the occasion which has brought us together this morning. More than fifty years have passed since the good providence of God, as I have always thought it, brought me to Oakham School. Sunday after Sunday, for three years, I attended the services in this Church. But, when I look around, I scarcely know the building again. So changed, so improved! “Surely the Lord is in this place!” May we realise His Presence now! And, then, the occasion that has brought us here. Three hundred years have elapsed since the foundation of the School in which so many of us who are present here this morning received our education. What a period in our country’s history! How eventful! How rich in blessings, when we thankfully count up our mercies; and how full of warnings, if we can read history aright! It is the preacher’s business to try and strike a note which shall govern the thoughts of his hearers and former school-fellows on the occasion of this third centenary celebration; and it has occurred to me that the text which I have chosen will furnish you with some suitable reflections. “One soweth, and another reapeth,” is true in the case of the Apostles. What would their labours have been if the prophets had not levelled and prepared the road before them? The prophets were the pioneers of the Apostles. The saying is applicable in the case of Oakham School—we have entered into other men’s labours, and a corresponding obligation rests upon us. The text was spoken, they could hardly doubt, to encourage the Apostles in the work which the eagle eye of the Master saw stretched out before them. It was meant to lighten their toil, and to cheer their labour by the prospect of the joy which both sower and reaper should share. Let us use it for a like purpose this morning. For no seriously-minded man could allow himself to believe that the sus-

Vol. XVIII.—No. 451.

tenance which the bounty of others had provided for him was meant simply to encourage him in a life of careless and indolent enjoyment. He might be painfully conscious that he was less industrious, less self-denying, and less thoughtful for the interests of others than he should be (and this is an uncomfortable ghost which at times we find it no easy matter to lay): but it could not be with an object such as I have named that we have entered into other men’s labours—it could not be with that view that the man whose memory we have in honour this morning laboured for the good of posterity in his day. It would be very interesting, if time served, to contrast the condition of things in 1584 with the state of the country in our own time: to follow up the hint which was lately thrown out in a local paper touching Oakham School and its Tercentenary, and contrast the things which Robert Johnson, Archdeacon of Leicester, looked upon, with the sight which day after day meets our own eyes. The three centuries have bridged over an interval which should indeed have lessons for the faithful student of history; but I cannot now unlock their treasures. Yet I would bid you thank God, on such a day as this, for the advantages which Robert Johnson, and such as he, have conferred upon their country. If the right date stood upon the outside of the School—1584—about forty years old must Robert Johnson have been when he founded the Schools and Hospitals at Oakham and Uppingham which bear his name. He was a man of whom this neighbourhood might well be proud, as one of its many worthies. The son of a member of Parliament for Stamford, brought up at Peterborough School, a fellow, first of Clare Hall, and then of Trinity College, Cambridge, he was evidently a man of considerable mark in his day. A quaint history of the family, left by the Archdeacon’s son Abraham, states that, by leave of his college and by license under Queen Elizabeth’s own hand, he went abroad for three years, and studied in France and other places, and afterwards travelled into Ireland; and in his office of chaplain-examiner to Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper, he “to his uttermost promoted religion and learning,” and whenever a good or competent living fell void he intimated the fact to “some in the Universities that he knew to be learned, pious, grave men,” that they might “come and get it as freely as might be.” He afterwards went to North Luffenham, the only place with the cure of souls which he ever had, and there, for fifty years, he resided, “and preached painfully, and kept good hospitality.” During this period, can we not understand this good parson of Luffenham casting about in his mind, and seeking direction from above, how best he could promote the glory of God, and benefit the neighbourhood in which his lines had fallen? Can we not see him casting about in his mind and seeking direction from above? Have you ever heard what the first words in his statutes were?—

"Having, by the grace of God, founded this——." Are there not those present who remember the inscription which he placed, or caused to be placed, over the door in the School in the churchyard?—"Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it." "Train up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." And, when the intention had taken deep root in his mind, can we not also discern the carefulness and consideration with which a man declining in years was carrying out his designs? He resolved to found and endow two Free Schools and two Hospitals of Christ in Oakham and Uppingham; and it is very interesting to remember that he did not obtain his statutes and ordinances for the government and maintainance of these institutions for forty years, and then he died. They were dated June 7th, 1625, and on July 24th he was buried at Luffenham, in the eighty-sixth year of his age. It is a marvellous retrospect when one attempts to realise what the work was which these two Schools had accomplished, what the comfort was which these two Hospitals had bestowed! Archdeacon Johnson laboured, and into his labours we have entered. I speak as one more deeply interested in Oakham School than any words of mine can express. It is no exaggeration to say that, if it had not been for my connection with this School, I should not have been preaching to you this day. My advancement in life and my present position I feel that I owe to Archdeacon Johnson and his foundation. Here it was that for three years, under Dr. Doncaster, I enjoyed the advantages of such teaching as few schools, if indeed any school, in England at that time could surpass. Here it was that men, whose names I shall ever hold in honour, gave me an instruction for which I can never be thankful enough. Gretton, the advantage of whose teaching I enjoyed for six short months before the removal of that gentleman to Stamford School; Hambleton, Welldon, Wilson, Scudamore—the greater part of whom remain until now, though two are fallen asleep! Here it was that I learned to look up to the men who had preceded me at school, and who had made names for themselves amongst the distinguished scholars of the land. Here it was that I made friendships, the memory of which, I trust, will never fade from my mind as long as my life shall last. Amongst my school and class fellows were Stevenson, Ellicott, Percival and Andrew Frost, Sheringham, Sidney Smith, the Bullivants, the Peakes, the Fields, the Roughtons, the Gibbons, and others whose names are amongst my most cherished recollections. I trust that the good work is being carried on still, and that the present generation of boys are realising that they too have entered into the labours of others, and that upon them the responsibility lies that they should be true to their trust. I speak as a father to his children—to his sons in whom he

delighteth, and whose welfare I would above all things promote. What was it that you have come to Archdeacon Johnson's school to learn? Shall I tell you? or would you not rather that Solomon should tell you? These were his words:—"Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding." Never say to yourselves—What does it matter whether I think or not of the use to which I shall hereafter put what I learn? Never say, What does it signify whether I work in a holy, God-remembering spirit, or in a careless, thoughtless—alas! it may be, a wicked—tone? Wisdom was the principal thing; therefore, with all thy getting, get understanding. This wisdom is promised to you in answer to earnest prayer and hard work. Knowledge, at the best, will vanish away; but the effect of work upon your character—earnest, persevering, successful work—this is permanent. It has the seal of eternity. Therefore, with all thy getting—with all thy heart, mind, soul, and strength—get understanding. Remember the words of St. Bernard, which described our own time quite as accurately as they could have described his, and which placed a mark where it ought to be placed—on all inferior ways of working, and on all poor reasons for seeking knowledge:—"Those there are who desire to know only in order that they may know, and this is curiosity. And those there are who desire to know that they may be known, and this is vanity. And those there are who desire to know that they may sell their knowledge (for wealth or for honours), and this is shameful trade. And those there are who desire to know that they may be built up, and this is wisdom." "That they may be built up!" That you may know the only true God the Father, and Him whom He hath sent, even Jesus Christ: for this is life eternal! May we therefore, all of us, before we part, pray to the Truth, which is God, that what we know not He will step by step teach us; that what we know of truth He will keep us in it; that what we are mistaken in (as man must be) He will correct; that when we fail He will strengthen us; and from all things that are false, and all knowledge that may be hurtful, deliver us for evermore. Amen.*

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has forwarded to the Earl of Mount Edgcombe a letter, received by him from Sir Henry Ponsonby, intimating that her Majesty has determined to give a donation of £200 to the Truro Cathedral Building Fund.

THE Bishop of London has appointed the Rev. William Dalrymple Fanshawe, curate of St. Michael's, Highgate, to be his resident chaplain. Mr. Fanshawe, who was a Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, took his degree in 1879 and was ordained last year.

* See "Sundays in Wellington College," page 25. By E. W. Benson.

PREJUDICE.

BY THE REV. H. HARRIS DAVIES, M.A.,
PH.D., VICAR OF LLANGOED, ANGLESEA.

SERMON PREACHED AT LLANGOED CHURCH, APRIL
6TH, 1884.

"Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now, Barabbas was a robber."—John x. 40.

THERE is something interesting and instructive to be found by the attentive reader in the history of all public men. The difficulties and the obstacles which many of them have to contend with, their wonderful perseverance and final success, make us admire them, though we differ widely from them in our estimates and views. The attentive reader of history not only profits from the general information which he derives from those who have distinguished themselves in life, but he particularly studies their plans and the means they employed for his own future guidance in life. Their failures and mistakes, if any, are to be regarded as so many shoals and latent rocks, and are to be carefully avoided; and all the turning-points and means of success must be faithfully followed.

But, of all the illustrious characters that ever graced the pages of history, it is that of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ that is the most interesting, the most glorious and blessed that ever was and ever will be. The blessed purpose which He had in view, the plan which He adopted, the difficulties which He overcame, and the glorious end which He attained, are all without a parallel in the records of time. And notwithstanding all the oppositions and the difficulties which He experienced from the world, the flesh, and the devil, He conquered them all; and though He died in the contest, yet He died a conqueror, and rose triumphantly from the dead, to inherit "the blessing, even life for evermore." One would naturally expect that a man of perfectly innocent life, unsullied by any act of sin, folly, or mistake—that a whole life devoted from beginning to end to the general good of others, should have been properly appreciated and worthily rewarded. But, alas! such was not the case, but quite the reverse. We find that innocency, goodness and virtue, have been often allowed to go unrewarded; whereas cunning, avarice, and vice have not only been permitted, but actually acknowledged and rewarded. But, of all the instances of criminal neglect, ingratitude, and cruelty that any body of men had ever been guilty of, none did ever equal those of the chief priests and the rulers of the Jews in the case of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The blessed purposes which He had in view, namely, "to seek and to save that which was lost," and His credentials, the mighty miracles, which He performed, were so clear that He came from God, that the Jews, as a nation, were left without any excuse. "If I

had not come [said He] and spoken unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin." Often did He refer them to His miracles as proofs of His divine mission, and said, "The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of Me." And again, "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not; but if I do, though ye believe not Me, believe the works." But such were the prejudice, the hatred, and the malice of the chief priests, the scribes, and the Pharisees against our Lord, that nothing but His life would satisfy them; and that they were determined to have, whatever might be the consequences. Indeed, the Jews as a nation seem to have been at this time shut up in unbelief, and reserved unto judgment. And so, notwithstanding that they were well acquainted with the history of Barabbas, as well as that of our Lord—though they knew he had been guilty of sedition, robbery, and murder, yet they demanded his release in preference to that of the innocent Jesus. And thus "they gained a murderer and lost a Saviour." And here we find that fiendish prepossession which we call *prejudice*, pronouncing judgment against the Innocent, contrary to evidence and contrary to the conviction of the judge himself; and so all justice and authority are disregarded and trampled under foot.

Now the subject to which I wish to draw your particular attention this morning is this—that prejudice generally begins on the part of the strong against the weak, and it is blind, cruel, inexorable, and often proves fatal in its results.

We are informed by St. Matthew that "the chief priests and elders, and all the council, sought false witnesses against Jesus that they might put Him to death." What a disgraceful thing to men in such high offices, and what a prostitution of justice! But, without these false witnesses, they could not have had a shadow of justice on their side, much as they wished to quench their rage in His innocent blood. Prejudice makes sworn enemies to sink their differences, bury their hatred, and make a common cause against the innocent when any danger is apprehended from the exposure of character, and the consequent loss of reputation, influence, and power. We read in Scripture that the Moabites and Ammonites were deadly enemies among themselves, and yet they were always united against Israel; and so we read also that "Pontius Pilate and Herod the king were made friends together" on the occasion of the mock trial and the execution of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We frequently read of men being bound together by feeling of strong affection and love; but here, in the case of Pilate and Herod, we find that prejudice had effected what reason and love could not accomplish, namely, making peace between two enemies, and tying them together to use all their united influence and power against the Son

of God. Wicked men can unite together in any piece of villany, but they cannot unite together in any *good* thing; and they can even join together to commit the blackest crimes, but they cannot unite to *love* one another, or to love their neighbours as themselves. O no! that is a point their etiquette can never reach. Their courtesy and deference to one another are altogether superficial and spurious, and therefore they never last much longer than the accomplishment of the temporary object or objects they may have in view. If a man's pretensions be well founded, and all the minutiae of his story can be proved by facts which cannot be contradicted, yet his antagonist, who has swallowed such a heap of indigestible prejudice against him will remain as far off from conviction as he would be if all his facts were the mere creations of his own imagination, and all his arguments were words without any meaning.

"Convince a man against his will, he'll be of the same opinion still." There is such an amount of foolish pride belonging to some people, that they would suffer *anything* rather than be obliged to acknowledge that they had done or even said anything wrong, or that they had failed in their undertaking, whatever that might be.

Having gone so far in their deadly hatred against an individual, they think it beneath their dignity now to withdraw. They have not the manly courage to acknowledge that they were in the wrong, and, therefore, they would sooner break than stoop.

If we could conquer their pride and refrain from taking any undue advantage on account of our success at the expense of their humiliation, there would be some hope of a permanent reconciliation, jealousy would be smothered, and the bond of charity would remain unsevered.

Prejudice will cause a man to shut his eyes against the clearest evidence, and will give all the appearance of truth to error. It will magnify every little imperfection into a capital offence and justify the most dishonest and foul means to accomplish its ends.

Prejudice will exert every nerve in the case of opposition, will bear no contradiction; it is impatient of human frailty, and cannot excuse any errors, faults, or mistakes in others. It will not wait to listen to any explanation; any attempt to give a detailed account of the whole matter or of the whole affair is out of the question, because the verdict, though wrong, has already been pronounced, and if you will dare ask them to reverse it, it is of no use,—they will only answer you in the words of Pilate and say,—“What I have written, I have written.”

Could you believe that any men of education, men of means, men of power and authority, would condescend to abuse them and by means of them do anything unmanly and unjust? Could they possibly do anything so cruel, as to crush the in-

nocent and the unprotected in order to gratify their wrongly preconceived opinion against him? Then, look at Herod the King, and Pontius Pilate the Roman governor; look at Annas and Caiaphas the two high priests. And though neither Herod nor Pilate could find any cause of death in the blessed Jesus, and though the latter openly confessed to the chief priests and the people, saying, “I find no fault in this man,” and having failed by anything like tangible, direct evidence to get any tribunal to pronounce the sentence of death against that “holy one and the just,” the high priests were so mortified and filled with rage at their unexpected rebuff that they were driven to their wits' ends. Having excited even the rabble against the innocent Jesus, and yet failed to succeed to compass their end—that these, who partly held the reins of government in their own hands, and yet could not manage to crush a poor, innocent wanderer, who had nowhere to lay his head, and had to depend upon the charity of others for the common necessities of life, was a thing unheard of, and was certainly not to be tolerated, let the consequences be what they will.

And what could they do in their dilemma? It is almost incredible that gentlemen in their high position in life, who were “princes of this world,” could stoop so low and be guilty of such a mean, unjust, cruel thing as they did. And what was it? They bribed a few miscreants, the vilest of the vile, to come forward and bear false witness against the innocent Jesus, and so to swear away his life. And now look at the foolish, criminal choice which they made. They chose Barabbas instead of Christ; a thief and a murderer, instead of the honest, tender hearted Jesus.

If you wish to form a righteous judgment of any man, then try to ascertain the objects of his choice, of his desires and pursuits; and, if having weighed them in the even balance of reason and experience, you will find they are foolish and dangerous, then you cannot help to pass the sentence, “Thou art found wanting” upon him. And when it so happens with any man that is brought under our notice, we generally say to one another, “Why, that man could not have been in his sober senses; he must have been mad, or he could never have acted as he did.” And thus it was also in the case before us. The people must have had their “understanding darkened, being alienated from the love of God through the ignorance that was in them, because of the blindness of their hearts.” Their prejudice against our blessed Saviour was so great, and their hatred and malice so implacable, that the people, high and low, rich and poor, went about blindfolded, and groped their way in helpless and fatal error to commit the foulest deed that was ever recorded in the annals of human crime. They had had every opportunity they could desire to put the divine mission of Christ to the test. The numerous and mighty miracles which He performed

were not done in a corner, but openly and in the presence of thousands at the same time; they were such as no one else ever did perform from the beginning of time up to this day. And His very enemies were invited to investigate the truth and the reality of everything that He ever did, and so to judge for themselves. "If I do not," said He, "the works of My Father, believe Me not." Here were men who, on account of their prejudice, could not believe their own senses; and so they verily fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah and which is quoted against them by our Lord Himself—"By hearing, ye shall hear and shall not understand, and seeing ye shall see and not perceive." A man must be sunk very low indeed in the scale of humanity when he makes theft his profession, but he is sunk lower still when he can add murder to it. When a man can deliberately, from evil intended beforehand,* take away the life of a fellow-man.

Well, this gives you an idea of the wretch whom the Jews preferred to our blessed Saviour: "not this man, but Barabbas; now, this Barabbas was a robber."

And St. Luke adds, that this Barabbas "was for sedition and murder cast into prison." Yes, this man, who had been guilty of sedition, which is the greatest crime a man can commit against the State, and guilty of murder, which is the greatest crime a man can commit against society, yet "Be astonished, O ye heavens," that this wretch, this villain, was, after all, preferred to Jesus, who never robbed any man of an atom in His life, nor shed, as far as we know, a drop of blood, even of the meanest brute, in His life. But apart from his innocent and guiltless life, considered in a negative point of view, just recall to mind the positive good which He did, and the inestimable blessings which He scattered abroad whithersoever He went. And behold a thief and a murderer, after all, preferred to Him! This shows us what judgment we should form of the fickle, giddy multitude; for "there are occasions where the popular voice is entirely wrong, and where the public opinion is entirely false."† And here it grieves me to be obliged to confess to you, that the world continues to this day very much the same as it was in the time of Christ. It is a well-known fact, that in this enlightened age, the innocent often suffer, and the guilty are let free. The foul breath of the multitude has often 'ere this, withered many a fair blossom among us, and blasted many a well-grounded hope. No prophet can tell us whom the public will crown to-morrow, and will guillotine the day after. Thank God for it, even those in high stations have not the power in our day and country that they used to have, but the same revengeful spirit still exists among many of us.

And this spirit we find not only among the ignorant poor, who had not the advantages of an early religious training, but also among those who have enjoyed this and other great privileges, and as such ought to be patterns to their inferiors in life.

"Revenge is sweet," even among the noble and the great; aye, and even among those who, like Annas and Caiaphas, are legally, in their ecclesiastical capacity, the leaders and the rulers of the people. And when these, like others, are misled by prejudice, begin to vent their spleen, and make a target of any poor man, it is an easy thing to raise the "hue and cry" after him, and so to hunt him down to ruin and to death. And, once the mischief is done, see the fiendish gratification it affords the cowardly assassins! They gloat their eyes upon the sea of misery they have created; and every sigh that is heaved, and every groan that is uttered, are music in their ears. And hear how they glory in the horrible details of the poor victim's agony and dying throes! We are not surprised to read that the Jewish rabble twitted and railed at our blessed Saviour while He hung upon the cross; but it sickens the heart when we read that the chief priests and the elders of the people joined with them.

And this proves that human nature is all the same in the high and the low, in the rich and the poor, in all ages and among all people. Mechanical science, though bordering upon the miraculous, has so far failed altogether to invent any means that can remove away prejudice from the human mind: there is nothing but divine grace that can effect this. And now, in conclusion, permit me to ask you individually, Which of these two will you prefer this day—Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews, or Barabbas, the thief and the murderer? Will you dare answer me and say, "We prefer Barabbas?" What then shall be done with Jesus, who is called Christ? Will you dare tell me, "Let Him be crucified"? As sure as the Jews have lost their city and temple, their country and their freedom, and have been scattered abroad to the four quarters of the globe in consequence of their rejection of Christ and His Gospel, unless some of you will timely repent of your unbelief and disrespect to the innocent, the meek and the lowly Jesus, His anger shall be kindled against you, and you shall be utterly consumed both root and branch! "Behold, He cometh with the clouds; and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him."

THE *Manchester Guardian* states that the Bishop of Brisbane will resign his see on the 31st of March next.

THE Bishop of London has discontinued his Monday attendances at London House until further notice.

* Ex malitiâ præcogitata.

† Dean Stanley.

NOTICES.

All communication respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 16, 1884.

SOCIALISM.

THIS is one of the "burning" questions of the day, and it is one which is exercising in no small degree the minds of many eminent men, and it is probable that as time goes on more thought will be given to it. It has been brought into prominent notice more especially by the appearance of Mr. Henry George's work, entitled "Progress and Poverty," a work which shows that the writer has given a great amount of thought and study to his subject, but whose conclusions it is impossible to endorse. Not only has Mr. Henry George, by his work, been a means of bringing forward the important subject of property, but it has also been taken up by some clergymen who are the ardent advocates of certain reforms; and to this may be added the appearance of the "Bitter Cry of Outcast London," which, by its sensational half-truths, has excited a great deal of attention. We can well understand the action in this matter taken by some clergymen, who, it may be, are working in the back slums of our great city, and who have seen the awful amount of misery and poverty which exists, although they have not sought publicity by rushing into print to tell all they know, and parade the sufferings of the people: and by others, it may be, who live in rural parishes, and who have seen the overcrowding in the labourer's cottage, and noticed how they live; where the labourer has to exist and bring up his, generally speaking, large family on a small sum—probably much less than that which his richer neighbour and landlord will spend in a single evening on luxuries at his club—who has to struggle hard with the waves of poverty, and possibly to end his days as an inmate of the union workhouse. But while all this is seen and known, yet we must look facts sternly in the face, and not be led on to propose and set up a panacea for those evils which undoubt-

edly exist, by repealing the Eighth Commandment, which we would remind our readers is positive as well as negative, by striking at the root of our social life, and by alienating all the land from those who now own it, in order to give it to the poor. Earnestness and zeal are capital things in their way, and we should get on badly without them; but then, before we agree to annul the Commandment of God, to break down our social house and social life, we must clearly understand what we are going to put in their place. Suppose that Mr. Gladstone were to apply the principle of his Irish land-legislation to England, and carry it to its logical conclusion, so as to make an equal division of the land amongst the rural population, and the poor were suddenly to be put into possession of the land which is in the hands of the landowner, and for which Mr. George says that they ought to pay no rent, what would they do with it? They have no capital to farm or to stock it; and then we must bear in mind that men who have been brought up to labour in the sweat of their brow, and who have never had very much money in their hands at any time, if it should happen that they come into any great amount, spend it very extravagantly. This has been seen and proved in numerous instances. If, then, all are to be made equal in the social scale, how will it begin, and where will it end? The beginning, most likely, would be chaos, confusion, and starvation; and the end very like our present social condition. Take, for instance, two men. They were lads together at school, both of them are the sons of poor parents. The one, it may be, is diligent, and tries to do his best, husbands all his spare money, and after a time embarks in business on his own account; success attends his efforts, and before many years have passed over his head he is a wealthy man; he feels for his poor relations, is never ashamed of them, and will do all he can to help them. The other has proved to be an idle, dissolute fellow, who will not work, and censoriously rails against those who are better off; and yet he might have been in a far better position if he would but have used the abilities and powers that God has given him. Is the diligent man to share his hard-earned gains with the idle fellow who would not work? If he acquires land and receives rent for it, in return for what he has laid out, is he to give up receiving the rent because others do not wish to pay, and say that he has no right to the land? Mr. Henry George would seem to make out a strong case, and pictures, in pathetic language,* the horrors which follow in the train of what he calls the robbery of the land, and speaks of how it levies a tax upon the earnings of the miners and the sailors; how it robs the shivering of warmth, the hungry of food; how it fills the gin-palaces; how it fills brothels with girls who might

* See "Progress and Poverty," p. 259.

have known the pure joys of motherhood; and quotes Mr. Herbert Spencer, who says, "*Had* we to deal with the people who originally robbed the human race of its heritage, we might make short work of the matter." Yet surely the picture is overdrawn to a degree: all the evils which Mr. George speaks of are not to be traced and laid at the door of this so-called land-robbery. If we are to trace back and examine the history of the title-deeds of all landed property (and why not of all other property?), we shall find that it is an extremely difficult and intricate task, so that we are afraid that the problem is one which is not capable of a really honest and practical solution. With regard to the land which at present is in the hands of some of our noble families, we feel that something can be said on behalf of the poor; the land in many cases belonged to the monasteries (how acquired by them we forbear to say), and, as such, was farmed by the monks, and they helped the poor and fed them. We read in Blunt's "*History of the Reformation*" that the pilgrim on his way hears the vesper bell at the monastery, and would repair thither, offer up his prayers and praises, have his frugal meal, and then retire to rest, and that early in the morn, after joining in the service and a frugal breakfast, would pursue his way. But when the monasteries were dissolved the abbey lands, which were lying waste, were given to the friends of the king and his courtiers. The lands have now increased immensely in value, and therefore those who are reaping the benefit from land thus acquired should and we believe do in an especial manner help the poor, and, at any rate, let them occupy some of the land at a reasonable rent, and thus if they should fail it will be no fault of the landowners. Again, with regard to the enclosure of common lands, which, except for the purpose of recreation, are of little benefit to the people, *i.e.*, the free-holders. No encroachments ought to be allowed, except after adequate compensatory payment for the common rights. With regard to this whole question of Socialism, before any of these great alterations can be made some time must elapse; but let every master, and every employer of labour, remember that the people he employs, no matter what the nature of the work may be, are rational beings endowed with faculties, that they have feelings and sensibilities just as much as other people have. Let the employers of labour show an interest in the well-being of those who are under them, and not, in the too eager desire to get gain, grind down and oppress the poor to the position of serfdom, or use men just as so many machines, capable of doing so much work, and when worn out to be thrown on one side as useless. A little careful thought and consideration will do a great deal. There is the danger of class-feeling, of the setting of class against class. The barriers want breaking down; for has not "God made of one flesh and

blood all nations of the earth?" and each one must learn and labour truly to get his own living, and to do his duty in that state of life into which it has pleased God to call him. "The poor shall never cease out of the land." Let us do what we can to raise men to a higher level. Combined personal effort will do far more than either platform speaking or sensational writing.

THE LOSS OF EDEN.

(Communicated by a Layman.)

THE figurative terms, Tree of Life and Tree of Knowledge, sufficiently indicate that the third chapter of Genesis is an allegory, concerning which if there be any doubt, that is silenced by the concluding passage, when man was excluded from Eden, and an armed guard placed to hinder his return. What we learn from this allegory is, however, matter of doubt, difficulty, and conjecture. It cannot be certain that the existence personified by the serpent was Satan; it cannot be certain that the eating of the fruit of knowledge was a sin otherwise than by disobedience of Divine injunction; it cannot be certain that the expulsion, with deprivation of access to the Tree of Life, was a punishment, or intended for such. Much, and much that is reasonable, may be said to establish that the serpent who tempted to disobedience was the mental faculty which St. Paul terms *φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός*, or perhaps *ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος*; and that the temptation to which our first ancestors gave way was the exaltation in rebellion to spiritual authority of that which is merely natural in the human constitution. I am not about to offer anything upon this part of the subject; nor am I upon the opinion, that the "fall of man" was not properly a fall, but a development; further than this, that if it were not in itself a step in the development of man's intellectual powers, the Divine Providence has made use of it to produce development of both his intellectual and spiritual powers, beyond all which in his pristine condition he was susceptible of. Many comfortable Scriptures assure us of this. I confine myself to a consideration of the design of the Almighty in the expulsion of man from Paradise, and of the purpose in excluding him from the use of the fruit of the Tree of Life.

Whatever the sin was of the first man who sinned, it was the setting of his limited and imperfect will against the infinite and perfect will of God. That he was free to choose between the evil and the good made this opposition possible. In the physical world, evil, as the opposition to the Divine order, is impossible, so far as we can apprehend; for the material world is not free, as beings with minds and wills are, and is capable therefore, not of being an agent, only of being acted upon. Evil and disorder are identical. When the finite will of man creates material evil, that material disorder, or interruption of Heavenly purpose, is set right by the wonderful operation of the self-acting machinery (if it be right to call it by so base a word) which God created, set in motion, and continually presides over. But moral or spiritual evil is not self-curing in its nature; it is the reverse; it is reproductive of itself, and tends to grow worse instead of better. I do not state this as accounting for it, though I think the fact

of the freedom of the will accounts for it sufficiently. I state it as matter of observation. This applies also to all man's works. We can make clocks that will go for a year without winding up; we cannot arrive at the perpetual motion. The most skilfully contrived self-adjusting engine of our making will only adjust itself when it goes wrong so long as the part does not become imperfect through wear. Moral disorder is like; it cannot restore itself to order,—the remedy must come from without.

It may be that the purpose of the Almighty, in planting both the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge in the garden, was that man should use them both; but that the time for their use was not yet come, and that the prohibition of the latter was to be withdrawn when the time should come. It is evident from what St. John saw in the visions of the Isle of Patmos that the Tree of Life was meant for us; and as God made—could make—nothing vainly, I am of the belief that His purpose was marred, not in the use of the fruit of knowledge, but in the use of it otherwise than according to His purpose. This I offer with diffidence; all that we know is, that that tree is no more spoken of in the Bible, while the Tree of Life is spoken of. Further, God exhibited no anger against man when he disobeyed. He cursed the serpent; He sentenced the woman to pains; He only reproached Adam. With His reproach He joined loving care; for He made both the man and the woman clothing, to hide their newly discovered condition of nakedness and shame. He sent them away from the garden into the outer world, and He kept the fruit of the Tree of Life from their reach by an awful and impassable barrier. But this is not represented as a punishment: I believe it was a precaution.

If man had stretched forth his hand, soiled with the juice of the forbidden fruit—his soul, perhaps his body too, infected and degenerated with the influence of that which to him was poison—and had gathered and eaten of that other fruit which was calculated to confer immortality, the kind of immortality which he would have acquired, it is not fanciful to believe, would have been the immortality of which the Devil and his angels partake—evil made perpetual and unremovable, a will alienated from God, heaven, and righteousness, and not alienated only, but incapable of reconciliation. We may not say that such could not have been the portion of the human race.

But our Maker, Redeemer, and Sanctifier in His perfect love and infinite care, saved us from this, at the cost perhaps of the merely passing pain of the loss of Eden. With like care He made the return impossible, by cutting us off from the power of obtaining any Spiritual knowledge which He does not communicate. Even that which He does communicate is sometimes unendurable in its awfulness: Moses durst not behold it. The mere mention of a spirit returning to this world from the other makes our hearts sink within us. The cherubim with the flaming sword still guard the gate.

All that is left is conjecture; and I hope that I conjecture in humility.

THE Rev. W. Churchill has resigned the rectory of Winterborne Stickland, Dorset, which he had held for fifty-three years. The venerable gentleman is eighty-two years of age.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—I believe in the real presence of Christ, not in the bread and wine of Communion, but with every assembly of faithful communicants; and this I believe not on the strength of the words, "This is My body," but on the strength of the promise, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them," "I am with you always, even to the end of time."

But I regard the words, "This is My body," as purely metaphorical. I see no disparagement of them in thinking them so, and know of no reason for believing that they can be anything else. If, however, proof is needed that they are to be metaphorically and not literally understood, such proof is contained in the saying, "I am the bread that came down from heaven;" for, as a matter of fact, our Lord's body did not come down from heaven. I heard this argument a long time ago, and have always thought it conclusive.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 9th August, 1884.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say how very greatly I approve of your leading article on "The Real Presence"? Your warning to the Church on this solemn subject cannot be too earnest or too often repeated. We have already heard of "the quasi-adoration of the sacred elements;" and when such a thought can find favour with good and holy men, there is cause for the gravest alarm: it is impossible to tell to what such views may lead.

Will you allow me a very few lines to set before your readers what has delivered my own mind from all difficulty on this subject, and may possibly deliver the minds of others also? When our Lord spake the words in question, He was a *living man*, like the other living men who were around Him at the table. His hands and all His bodily members were like their hands and their bodily members: the same living current of warm blood which was circulating through their bodies was circulating through His also. The bread, we must suppose, was in the palm of the left hand; and laying the right hand upon it, He said, "*This is my body.*" The flagon of wine was also in the left hand; and laying His right hand upon it, He said, "*This is my blood.*" He was using these words either metaphorically or literally. If He spake metaphorically, as when He said, "I am the true vine," "I am the door," there is no difficulty. But if He spoke literally, He had *two bodies*; and from two bodies, two bloods are inseparable, for "the blood is the life of all flesh." There was therefore present in that upper room, on that solemn evening, a *double Christ*. There was the living body which next morning was to be scourged and crucified; there was the lifeless bread which He then held in His hand: both were His body. There was the blood which was then circulating through His sacred veins; there was the wine which He had poured into the flagon; both were His blood. I need not tell your readers that this turns Christianity into an absurdity; but it is the inevitable consequence of denying that our Lord was speaking metaphorically on the evening before He died. You remark most truly on His displeasure with the twelve because they

thought He was speaking of the "leaven of bread." "Are ye also yet," He said, "without understanding?" Surely the same blessed Master has more cause to be displeased now.

I pressed this thought upon a lady who had joined the Roman Catholic Church. She said, in reply, "It was a miracle, and miracles do not admit of argument." But no miracle is a violation of common sense or an outrage on our common nature. To maintain that it is so, is the quintessence of blasphemy.

WILLIAM TAIT.

SIR,—I am much obliged for Canon Crosthwaite's letter. I think he raises a very important question by his suggestion, "*If substance can exist separate from accidents.*" Bishop Harold Browne deals with the same idea thus: "The doctrine, then, of transubstantiation is the established doctrine of the Roman Church. There is still, however, room for a difference of statement and difference of thought upon the subject. It appears to be ruled that the substance only, not the accidents, undergoes a change. Now it is almost questionable whether the accidents do not comprise all the properties of matter. If so, the change may still be spiritual rather than material."

I still hold to what I said, that few Protestants—probably not one in a thousand—understand what is meant by transubstantiation, viz., that the change of *substance* is the change of one "supposed but unknown support of accidents" for another. And for myself, though I do not practise any form of Eucharistic adoration, I feel slow to charge either Ritualist or Romanist with idolatry, who worships *certainly not* the accidents of bread and wine, but the *substance* of Christ's body and blood, which he believes underlies them. Sir, with all due respect, you take too shallow a view of this mystery: there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy. Some of the best minds in Europe were for centuries engaged upon it, and it cannot be lightly put aside as a mere foolish conceit. I have shown that Broad Churchmen, like Stanley and Thirlwall, did not caricature the Roman doctrine, and I am content to stand and fall with them in the matter.

I do not know what allegory Goethe may have had in view in his little poem, *Der Erlkönig*; but the father, as it proved, was wrong in supposing the child's vision to be a misty cloud:—

"Mein Sohn, was birgst du so bang dein Gesicht?"

"Sieh'st, Vater, du den Erlkönig nicht?"

"Den Erlkönig mit Kron' und Schweif—

Mein Sohn, est ist ein

NEBELSTREIF."

[We do not caricature, but deny, the doctrine of transubstantiation, because it does not limit mystery to its proper region, viz. that which concerns our spirits and their relations to the Divine Persons and the spiritual world, but forces it into the material world, to which the body, bodily senses and functions belong, in a way which amounts to a miracle, and makes priests workers of miracles, whereas St. Paul says they are merely "ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." We would remind our esteemed correspondent that the bread and wine representing our Lord's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, are, in a physiological view, very just, close and beautiful analogies of the communion of our spirits with Christ's Spirit.—ED.]

DIOCESAN SYNODS.

SIR,—In your article of this day, on Diocesan Synods, you say:—

"We are glad to see that at the recent meeting of the Southern Convocation it was proposed that there should be a Laymen's House, and that the laity should discuss questions undeterred by the presence of the clergy."

I ought to be able to form an opinion on the subject, in consequence of having been a lay member of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland ever since disestablishment, and it is my decided opinion that the advantage of taking the laity into Convocation will be thrown away if they deliberate apart. The satisfactory results of synodical government in the church of Ireland could not, I believe, have been obtained if the debates had not been in common between the clergy and the laity. In order that opinion may be intelligently formed, people with different mental training, different experience, and different kinds of knowledge must have the opportunity of exchanging ideas. It will be quite practical to arrange for the clergy and laity voting separately, though deliberating together.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 9th August, 1884.

Reviews and Notices.

"A TRIP TO AMERICA," with Map. By William Hardman. London: T. Vickers Wood, 1884. Pp. 210.

WE have been much pleased with the perusal of this excursion into the great Anglo-Saxon Republican community. The great feature of the work is that it describes the minor institutions of the country, such as railways, churches, schools, prisons, hospitals, asylums, and theatres by a very competent and experienced hand. With the exception of the railways, theatres, and their management, it seems that none of these institutions are superior to our own. The author had full opportunities of judging the railways and their management, as he took, with a large party of friends, a long journey of 3,500 miles from New York over the Northern Pacific Railroad as far as the Mammoth Hot Springs on the Yellowstone River.

Of the Pennsylvania Railroad between Chicago and New York he says the entire distance of over 1,000 miles is accomplished in twenty-six and-a-half hours without any jarring or bumping. "It is certainly the steadiest line I ever travelled upon. The engine takes up its water supply from the track tanks as it goes along, and the time is made by uniformity of progress more than by increased speed." If the author was not the chairman of the Surrey bench of magistrates, and did not in other parts of the book express very sober and accurate opinions of what he saw, we should, as regards the mechanical appliances and ingenuity of the Americans, have thought that he was romancing to a very considerable extent. For instance, he writes that when a monster hotel, Palmer House, Chicago, which had nearly two acres of marble floor, and accommodated 800 guests, required additional rooms in 1877, Mr. Palmer raised the entire roof, constructed of iron and cement, and of enormous weight, and carried up the walls. Five hundred jack-screws were

used, being moved in unison to the sound of the foreman's whistle; and meanwhile the business of the hotel was not interrupted, the 800 guests in the house knowing nothing of what was going on. Of the provisions for the extinction of fire at the same place, he writes:—

In a city which has suffered so much from conflagrations, the arrangements for the prevention and extinction of fires are naturally brought to a very high pitch of perfection, and, in fact, are not unlike a well-practised pantomime trick. The moment an alarm of fire is given, a single turn of a handle liberates the horses, an automatic whip touches their flanks—not that it is needed, for these animals know their duty—the harness suspended over them drops on their backs, they walk to their places on either side the pole, the collar closes on their necks with a spring, the driver, who may be sleeping in the floor above, is turned out of bed and comes through a trap-door into his seat, and the engine is on its way to the scene of destruction in less time than it has taken me to write this.

Our readers will be interested to observe that the author duly notes the survival of old English customs and of Puritan notions and religious observances in the Eastern States, whilst in the far Western States the religious services and observances are of a more outward, showy, and ritualistic character. The following is a description of the Episcopal Church in Fargo, the mushroom capital of Dakota:—

After breakfast I determined to see what sort of a place the Episcopal Church of "Gethsemane" would be, and after plodding along the wooden side-walks, which are the rule in these out-of-the-way places, I came to a very unpretending structure, of course built of wood. To my amazement on entering, I found myself in a beautiful little church of the best Anglican type. All the fittings, except a handsome stone font, were of pine wood, substantial and in admirable taste. The sittings were free. There was a rood screen, prettily carved seats for the choir, a lectern, and a neat pulpit. The altar was decorated with flowers and prairie grasses surrounding a brass cross, and was vested with a beautifully embroidered altar-cloth of green satin.

After service I had the pleasure of being introduced to the rector, the Rev. B. F. Cooley, and I then found that the seasons of the Church were duly marked by equally handsome altar-cloths of appropriate colours, one of the cloths having been given by a gentleman of New York, the others having been embroidered by members of the congregation.

Presently the organist played an opening voluntary, and, singing a processional hymn, a choir, twenty-six in number, all in cassocks and surplices, headed by a cross-bearer, marched in and took their places. I could scarcely believe my eyes. Here, in this remote spot, in the very heart of the American continent, was a church and a service that was an example to scores of churches at home. Everything was done with the greatest reverence and care, and following the best traditions of the Anglican Church.

Mr. Cooley preached us an excellent sermon on the Good Samaritan, and made an earnest appeal for funds for the further enlargement of the church, which has already been enlarged once during his incumbency of only twenty-six months. Yet even now it only holds 200 persons, and then is crowded. Mr. Cooley told me he had 150 communicants, and that he had a choral celebration once a month; the usual early celebration at eight being plain. Gethsemane Church was built in 1875, two years after the first lots in Fargo were sold by the Northern Pacific Railroad Company. In 1872 Fargo was inhabited only by the wild Indian.

It was a very great pleasure to find the spiritual wants of our Church people in the Far West so well cared for, concurrently with their material interests, nay, almost in advance of them. The ground has been acquired for a Cathedral, and Fargo will be an episcopate before many months are gone.

There are slight but curious differences between our Anglican services and those of the American Episcopalians. But substantially, so far as I could judge, there was no material discrepancy.

The lessons are read from the version sanctioned by the American Bible Society. Various amusing concessions are made to Republican prejudices. For example, "King of kings and Lord of lords," is changed to "Supreme Ruler of

the Universe." For some reason or other, too, the good old Saxon word "wealth" has been replaced by "prosperity."

There are forty-nine places of worship of all denominations in Fargo. The Roman Catholics and Lutherans are largely in the majority in point of population, the Lutheran element being due to the numbers of Scandinavians who settle in this locality.

During the six months which have elapsed since my visit, "Gethsemane" has been greatly enlarged, and the total capacity of the church, inclusive of the gallery on the west side, is not far short of 500 sittings. Every one of these sittings was occupied when Bishop Walker, of North Dakota, in whose diocese Fargo is, paid his episcopal visit in February last. It was a notable occasion for the Episcopalians of Fargo, and Mr. Cooley had good reason to feel proud of the success that had attended his unflinching exertions.

CANON CAPEL CURE, of St. George's Hanover-square, has been installed at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the room of the Bishop of Ripon.

THE Merchant Taylors' Company have made a donation of ten guineas to the London Diocesan Lay-Helpers' Association in view of the coming Mission.

THE church of the Holy Trinity, Bengoe, an outlying parish adjoining Hertford, has just been much improved, and the chancel was reopened on Sunday week. The church was erected more than five-and-twenty years since, when the available funds only permitted a very simple though well-proportioned chancel. The altar has now been set upon a footpace, a handsome stone credence and polished brass altar-rail have been added, the sanctuary has been enlarged, and the pavement relaid with encaustic tiles. New oak choir seats and pulpit have been provided, and other improvements effected under the advice of Mr. Edmund Ferry, the architect. These works were originated by the rector, the Rev. S. Mansel Pleydell.

IF (says the Sydney correspondent of the *Record*) I were to record one-half of the sayings and doings of our Bishop, or Primate, as he is generally termed, I should require much more than a complete issue of the *Record*. His short residence among us of two months has enabled us to verify the statement of the Archbishop of York, that the Church at home has given to her Australian daughter of her very best, in the gift of Bishop Barry. By his able sermons and speeches, his great mental vigour, his zeal, his force of character, his sweetness of disposition, his decision, his humility, his readiness to work with all good men, so far as he is able, his love for the truth—for the cause of his divine Master—by these combined qualities he has won the heart of the community.

THE following address has been presented to the Bishop of Ripon, signed by upwards of 130 of the clergy:—"We, the undersigned clergy of the diocese of Ripon, with ready mind greet your lordship on the occasion of your being placed over us in the Lord, and desire to approach you with the expression of our dutiful respect and regard for your lordship's office and person, and of our sympathy and earnest desire to co-operate with you according to our power, in the arduous work of ministering to the spiritual wants of this large and important diocese. The question of the diocesan conference is one which must shortly press itself upon your lordship's attention, and it is of the utmost importance that it should have the confidence of the clergy and laity of the diocese; we therefore take this early opportunity of expressing our conviction that the number of ex-officio clerical members is excessive in proportion to the number of

elected members in the conference as at present constituted, and we respectfully ask your lordship to consider whether some, and, if so, what re-arrangement in that respect, as also in the mode of the election of members, may commend itself to your lordship's approval."

LAST week a meeting was held at the Minster Library, York, in furtherance of a movement for providing a supplementary endowment fund for Trinity College, Toronto. The Archbishop presided, and a statement was made by the Rev. R. H. Starr, who said that for the efficient working of the Church University the following were the most pressing needs:—1. The thorough equipment of the Physical Science Department by the erection and furnishing of a laboratory, and completing the endowment of the Professorship. 2. The making adequate provision for post-graduate study on the part of the best men, by the foundation of three fellowships, the holders of which will reside in college, take part in the teaching, and pursue some definite course of study in the higher branches of their respective departments. 3. The endowment, in whole or in part, of Professorships in the following subjects:—Theology, History, English, and English Literature, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Modern Languages. 4. The erection of a separate building to supplement the present inadequate accommodation for students, and also of a suitable college chapel. After hearing the rev. gentleman's appeal a resolution expressing warm sympathy in it was adopted on the motion of the Dean, seconded by the Hon. and Rev. Canon Forester.

On Friday week the Standing Committee of the National Society held a special meeting. An application from the founder of Christ Church, Cannes, requesting the society to accept the trusteeship, was again discussed at great length, and the following minute was adopted:—"The National Society, in agreeing to accept Mr. Woolfield's bequest, does so on the condition that it will not interfere with the occupation of the property by the English congregation (otherwise then by charging a rent), so long as that congregation discharges all expenses of every kind connected with it, it being understood that no expense can be allowed to fall on the funds of the society. The society observes that the Rev. H. Percy Smith is the present incumbent, and that it is the wish of Mr. Woolfield that the present and all future incumbents shall hold the incumbency so long only as they hold the licence of the Bishop of Gibraltar or his successors. The acceptance of the bequest is, however, subject to the following conditions:—1. That a legal opinion affirms that it is not inconsistent with the terms of the National Society's Charter to hold Church property in France. 2. That the acceptance of the proposed benefaction be found to be entirely valid under the French law." Important questions having been raised as to the work of the Examining Board for Church Training Colleges, it was agreed to refer their consideration to a sub-committee, with instructions to confer with the Examining Board, and especially with the secretary, the Rev. John Menet. It was further agreed that the sub-committee consist of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of Gloucester and Rochester, Lord Colchester, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Mr. Powell, the Rev. G. H. Hodson, Canon Gregory, and Canon Wingfield.

INHERITED SENTIMENT.—Professor Seeley, in an article on "Goethe," published in the August number

of the *Contemporary Review*, offers the following interesting remarks on the subject of inherited sentiment:—"Some of those who watched Rosetti at his work thought they discovered that he did not regard his own imaginations seriously. . . . Similarly, Mr. James remarks of Hawthorne that it would be a great mistake to infer from the constant recurrence in his romances of the ideas of sin, retribution, and the stricken conscience, that Hawthorne himself was under the influence of such sombre ideas, the truth being that he was an easy-going, contented, and comfortable man. But Hawthorne's Puritanic ancestors took these ideas seriously, and Rosetti's Italian ancestors in like manner furnished the beliefs which in their secondary form suggested Rosetti's pictures and poems. Of all artists, it is Scott who is richest in this kind of inherited sentiment. The shrewd, good-natured, somewhat worldly Scotch lawyer lives in a world of grandiose thoughts, opinions, sentiments, and convictions, out of which he composes at his ease a whole literature; and yet if you ask him what he thinks of these thoughts, opinions, sentiments, and convictions, he can only smile and evade the question. 'Superstition,' he says candidly, 'is very picturesque, and I make it at times stand me in good stead, but I never allow it to interfere with interest or convenience.' They were serious enough to his ancestors, these ideas of clannish devotion, of chivalry, of witchcraft and demonology; but to him they have come simply by inheritance. All he knows is that when he unlocks the ample chambers of his imagination he finds them there; that they work up into capital stories, if hardly fit for practical use; that, in short, they are the old furniture of the house in which Nature has placed him."

ON Monday evening the long illness of Bishop Piers Claughton ended, we regret to say, in his death at 2, Northwick-terrace, Maida Hill. Born in Lancashire in 1812, he had a successful career at Oxford, where he took a First Class in *Lit. Hum.* in 1835. He obtained the prize for the Chancellor's prize essay in 1837, the subject being "The Concurring Causes which assisted the Promulgation of the Religion of Mahomet," was fellow and tutor of His college (University) and Public Examiner and select preacher. He was ordained in 1837 and in 1845 he was appointed rector of Elton, Huntingdonshire, where he introduced in a modified and somewhat primitive form the harvest festivals which have since become so popular. On Whitsun Tuesday, 1859, he was consecrated at Westminster Abbey Bishop of St. Helena, with the present Bishop of Bangor and Bishop Tufnell, formerly of Brisbane. The most notable event of his short tenure of the see was the part he took at the Cape Synod in the condemnation of Dr. Colenso. In 1862 he was translated to the see of Colombo, which he successfully administered for eight years. In 1870 he returned to England, and was appointed Archdeacon of London and Canon of St. Paul's. In 1875 he was nominated by Lord Cranbrook, Chaplain-General to the Forces. As practical coadjutor to the Bishop of London (says the *Morning Post*), he worked indefatigably, taxing his strength, indeed, unduly by constant preaching and confirming, and aiding the clergy of the most out-of-the-way parishes by his presence and kindly sympathy. One Sunday's work in 1875 may be taken as a specimen of many more. Soon after ten he was opening a new infant school at Millhill, and confirming at eleven; soon after three he was on the other side of

the Thames, at Newington, confirming in Bishop Maclagan's then parish; and in the evening he was preaching some twenty miles from London for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The great advantage of the chaplain-general being able to administer confirmation was evident in the increased number of soldiers who came forward and in the reverence of the services amidst the too often irreverent surroundings of barrack chapels. The Archdeacon took a leading part in the debates of Convocation, as to the importance of which in the early days of its revival he addressed a letter to the late Earl of Derby. A more kindly, hardworking, and conscientious prelate has never lived. His brother, Dr. Thomas Legh Claughton, is Bishop of St. Albans. The funeral of the lamented prelate took place on Friday. At eleven, there was a funeral service at St. Paul's, before the remains were removed to Elton for burial. The clergy of the Archdeaconry were specially invited to attend.

A BIOGRAPHICAL notice of the late rector of Lincoln College in the *Academy* tells us that "Mark Pattison was always a friend to every well-considered project for furthering the education of women. He was visitor of Bedford College for Ladies; and his last public appearance was to deliver a lecture there to the students last autumn, in which he showed all his usual grace, and even more than his usual sarcasm, in reviewing some of the methods of modern criticism. The rector's tone of mind was melancholy, but he always grew excited and was cheered by good conversation, and he had a fund of humour easily at command. He was somewhat valetudinarian, and when really ill his friends did not at first recognise all the gravity of the symptoms, for he had cried 'Wolf' so often. Yet, despite of this gloom and weak health, he was in some points younger than his years. An eager croquet and lawn-tennis player till a recent period, he was loth when engaged in those games to admit that he was growing old. There was to him an additional pleasure in these pastimes because it brought him into the society of the young. Courteous to all women, he particularly liked to have young women about him; and there are those among them who will never forget the stimulus, intellectual and moral, they gained from their association with Mark Pattison. His last literary labour has been to dictate to his niece, and two or three young friends who have been privileged to share the labour, his recollections of the Oxford movement; and this will be, at no distant time, given to the world. A pathetic incident took place in his last illness, when it was known that the end was near. Cardinal Newman, whom the rector had never met since that sad day when, staying at the Observatory, Newman took leave of his early friends, intimated a wish to visit him. The rector declined, dreading the agitation which the expectation of such an interview would cause. But the Cardinal probably saw in the refusal a real desire for the meeting if it could be arranged without this nervousness of anticipation. Therefore he went to Oxford, when the rector was somewhat better, was admitted, and had a long interview, they two alone, to the rector's very great pleasure. Neither of the two men, so reticent of their feelings, so shy, and so affectionate, was likely to disclose to any what passed; but it is impossible not to wish that the pen of the elder man might record that interview as he did the final meeting with and parting from Keble at Hursley, in the year before Keble died. On Pattison, however,

Newman's influence had been more intellectual and less directly spiritual than were the relations between Keble and Newman. There have been those who, judging from a very imperfect knowledge of a few facts, and from the name of the book by which he is best known, have fancied that George Eliot had the rector's studious habits in mind to a certain extent when she drew the character of Mr. Casaubon in 'Middlemarch.' There was, however, nothing in common between the serious scholar at Lincoln and the mere pedant frittering away his life in useless trivialities; nor was George Eliot, Mark Pattison's friend, at all likely to draw a caricature of one she loved and valued. It was reserved for a vulgar and frivolous spirit to dare, in a more recent and inferior novel, such foolish insult to good taste. The rector married in 1862 a lady whose name is well known to all readers of the *Academy*. Mrs. Pattison, in delicate health for many years, and obliged to live much abroad, has had the melancholy satisfaction of having been able to return from the South of Europe at an earlier period than has usually seemed safe, and to devote herself to nursing her husband."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Barham, Rev. F. C., M.A., Vicar of Mabe Penryn; Vicar of Knowl-hill, Twyford.
 Barnard, Rev. Henry, M.A., Prebendary of Wales and Vicar of Yatton; Vicar of Pucklechurch, with the Chapelries of Westerleigh and Abzon.
 Bence, Rev. G. W., M.A., Vicar of Bishopston, near Bristol, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Bristol Cathedral.
 Braine, Rev. George Taylor, Curate of Holy Trinity, Hampstead, and Assistant-Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews; Vicar of Liskeard, Cornwall.
 Cross, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Southport; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
 Darley, Rev. Bertram, Brother of the Royal Hospital of St. Katherine's, Regent's Park.
 Doolan, Rev. Robert Reid Arthur, Rector of Corscombe, Dorset.
 Fanshawe, Rev. William Dalrymple, M.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Highgate; Resident Chaplain of the Bishop of London.
 Gell, Rev. Francis, Curate-in-Charge of Lydd, near Folkestone; Kent; Rector of Edburton, Sussex.
 Hamilton, Rev. Charles Chetwood, M.A., late Curate of St. Matthew, Quebec, Vicar of Fillongley.
 Macdonald, Rev. William Coules; Vicar of Stockingsford.
 Maughan, Rev. William Morland, late Curate of Martley; Chaplain of Martley Union Workhouse.
 Postance, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Toxteth-park; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
 Read, Rev. John Thomas, B.A., Curate of Ashton-under-Lyne; Vicar of New St. George's, Stalybridge.
 Smale, Rev. W., M.A., Curate of St. Jude, South Kensington; Vicar of St. Philip's, Earl's-court, Kensington.
 Storrs, Rev. George Noel, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bridlington Quay; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Tonbridge, Kent.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Billopp, Rev. William Thomas Nicholls, Vicar, at the Vicarage, St. James's, Greenstead-green, on the 7th inst.
 Crook, Rev. Henry Simon Charles, M.A., J. P., for the County of Wilts, and formerly Vicar of Upavon, in that county, at 6, Darlington-street, Bath, on the 4th inst.
 Claughton, Right Rev. Bishop Piers, D.D., Archdeacon of London, Chaplain-General to the Forces, at Northwick-terrace, N.W., on the 11th inst.
 Ingston, Rev. George W. D., Vicar of Farnborough, Kent, at Southsea, Hants, on the 30th ult., aged 42.
 Marshall, Rev. Charles, M.A., for thirty years Rector of that parish, at the Rectory, Harpurhey, Manchester, after a very short illness, on the 23rd ult., aged 64.



The Church of England Pulpit.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

BY THE REV. A. S. FARRAR, D.D., PROFESSOR
OF DIVINITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE.

"Thy kingdom come."—MATTHEW vi. 10.

OUR Saviour, in giving this petition as a legacy to His disciples, as well as in His farewell command to teach all nations, proclaimed that His religion was to be a mission; that His followers were under an obligation to assert the imperial supremacy of the truth which He had communicated. It is this topic to which our thoughts are to be directed on this Sunday. For a generation ago, when the revival of Church life was recalling to men's minds the inseparable connection of the idea of the Church with that of the Gospel, an individual as conspicuous for good sense as for Churchlike piety, the late Mr. Markland, suggested to a generous benefactress, the late Mrs. Charlotte Ramsden, the endowment of a Sermon in each of our two Universities, to impress on those who were preparing themselves for God's work in Church and State the duty of "Church extension over the colonies and dependencies of the British Empire," *i.e.*, over the colonies which are our daughter States, and over the dependencies which Providence has intrusted to our rule.

These two benefactors probably had a lingering hope that England, if aroused to the sense of her missionary duty, might be induced to devote public funds and create national endowments for that object. That hope is now gone for ever. But Providence has, nevertheless, so stirred the hearts of English Churchmen in the last thirty years, that the work has been organized, though by means of the strain of voluntary contributions, to an extent which at that time would have seemed chimerical. Missions have been planted; daughter Churches have sprung up; bishops have been dispersed; and the Anglican Church, in her integrity of doctrine, institutions, and ritual, has been spread throughout the world, till the light of truth, glancing from land to land, has girdled the globe: *φῶς τὸδ' οὐκ ἀπαππον Ἰδαίου πυρός.*

And perhaps no better mode could be found this day of enforcing upon our consciences the duty of Church extension, than some consideration of the signs of cheering hope and gratitude which

the missionary work presents to us; for, while few persons who believe in Christianity, or who think that it contains sufficient truth to make it worthy of being diffused, would deny in the abstract the duty of helping to diffuse it; yet they are often chilled in acting out their conviction, by the seeming hopelessness of missions, or by the altered relation of Christianity to other creeds which the comparative study of religions has introduced; Christianity seeming thereby to be dethroned from its claim of possessing a monopoly of truth. Now perhaps the best mode of exorcising from ourselves the former of these two misgivings, and in part the latter, is by making such a study of the history of Christian Missions from the beginning of the Church as may lay bare the causes of missionary success and failure. When we thus approach the subject on its intellectual side, and are able to place the missions of our own Church in their true perspective, we discover (as we hope) that the Anglican Church in the present age is following the example of those ages and Churches whose missions have endured and whose influence has been elevating, and thus we cannot fail to have our interest in the missionary extension of our Church aroused, and the sense of our own duty intensified, to assist by direct and indirect means in furthering its spread. I intend, accordingly, now to offer a very brief outline of the history of Christian missions, in the hope that such a narrative may by its instructiveness fulfil the purpose of the founders of this Sermon. We may, for the sake of clearness, divide the history of missions into four periods:—

1. First, Christianity subdued to itself the Roman Empire and the antique civilisations with which it was brought into contact. This occupied four centuries.

2. Next, it passed beyond the limits of the old civilisations, and strove gradually to bring Northern and Central Europe to the faith. This occupied about seven centuries, *viz.*, from A.D. 600 to 1300.

3. Thirdly, when the discoveries of Columbus and De Gama, about 1,500, had unveiled new worlds in West and East to conquer for Christ, the Roman Catholics strove, under Xavier and others, to gather in for the Redeemer a new harvest of souls. This occupied a little more than a century.

4. Lastly, the great colonial people, the Anglo-Saxon race, has, during the last century and a half, striven to spread over colonies and heathendom the faith and rites of the Reformed Church.

These are our four periods, *viz.* (speaking roughly), the Mission to the South of Europe; the Mission to the North of Europe; the Missions to the Nations outside of Europe, first by Roman Catholics and next by Reformed Communions. Let us dwell briefly on each.

1. When Christians first went forth from Judæa to conquer the world, looking eastward they would,

see the fragments of the decaying civilisations of ancient Asia, and westward, the great Roman Empire, the congeries of nations and institutions and cults, which gravitated to Rome or received their civilisation from it. The world's civilisation lay around the Mediterranean Sea. But the world was heathen, and to a contemporary the empire seemed at its zenith of power. Christianity had to teach, or awaken that world to such thoughts as the unity of God, the nearness of God, the responsibility of man's soul, the future life, the very meaning of salvation, and the history of Jesus. It had to dethrone the queen of powers, to denationalize the civilised world. The agents in this wild adventure were of the Jewish people, a nation despised for its isolation and its barbarism; but in about three hundred years this dream became a real fact. The weak things of the world had confounded the strong.

What were the causes of this mighty moral and political revolution? The solution of the problem has been sought alike by theologians and by sceptical writers, who have tried to minimize the originality of Christianity and the preternatural wonder of its diffusion. The greatest of historians, Gibbon, the Michael Angelo of history, suggested various secondary agencies discernible in the nature and institutions of Christianity, which contributed to the accident of this success. There was really no ground for alarm at his analysis. We may thank Gibbon for it, and accept him as an unconscious witness on behalf of Christianity. Grant to him the potency of the causes which he names; multiply their power as you like; and you still leave a residuum outstanding, the mightiest marvel of history unsolved, viz., the mightiest of revolutions effected by the most paltry of causes. Nor have modern and even Christian writers always been more successful in solving the problem. They have sometimes pointed as the great cause to the yearning of devout heathens who were made ready for Christianity. Unfortunately for this theory, these very men who logically ought to have accepted Christianity, because they thirsted for the truth which it unveiled, were always its most bitter and intelligent opponents. Or they have pointed to the collapse of heathenism, the exhaustion of the popular faith, the religious eclecticism which was so tolerant that it could contentedly admit a new claimant like Christianity into its Pantheon. The facts are exactly the reverse. It could be shown that Christianity had to make headway against a very dogged reaction in favour of heathenism which pervaded the Roman world in the second century; a not unintelligent resuscitation of national faith linking itself with Roman patriotism. Heathenism was felt to be intertwined with the national life and sanctified by the national history. Art, learning, and poetry had consecrated the heathen creed in the public mind. The temples which still crumble in ruined majesty, grand even

in their decay, were then the pride of each city; the numberless altars and sculptures which reveal themselves to the spade of the excavator then enlisted the sympathy or embodied the conviction of heathen faith. It is not to the decay of heathenism that you can attribute the growth of Christianity.

Or again, in this search for causes, it has been said that Christianity met with no intelligent opposition from heathen writers; and so, enjoying a monopoly of learning, it advanced its claims by clever treatises of defence. Quite the reverse. The writings at least of Celsus and of Porphyry against Christianity, though known to us only in fragments, will bear comparison with the acutest and most insidious attacks of our own day; while among its writers, for three centuries at least, Christianity could show only one really brilliant mind, that of Origen; and the apologetic treatises of the Christian Fathers are mostly so pointless, that we wonder how any one could be convinced by them. Nor must we again, as we might be inclined to do, attribute the success of Christianity in part to the sight of the public martyrdoms endured by its disciples, or of the tender devotion of Christians in nursing the sick in times of public pestilence. The heathen mind, as could be shown, was too brutal to be able to feel pity and sympathy, too degraded to be touched by the sight of self-sacrifice.

Or, perhaps you say, shift the point of view. The cause of the victory of Christianity was not the weakness of the opponent system, but its own inherent strength. The Christians were still holy; the Church was free from heresy, unrent by schism. No! the Church never was an Eden. — In the second century, at least, the Church was honeycombed through with heresy, and weakened by the treason of Gnostics, who wished to absorb Christianity into philosophy, and to surrender the historic verity of Christianity for idealism; or humiliated by the fanaticism of Montanists, who wished to substitute superstitious enthusiasm for a reasonable religion. What, then, was the cause, what the causes which gave to Christianity its victory? Brethren, I must be content to give you the simple answer—"Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." Allowing some action of all the above and other such-like causes, I nevertheless confess that I can attribute the victory of Christianity mainly to one cause alone. I am content to believe that the eternal Saviour, the living, risen Saviour, was watching His Church from His throne on high, fulfilling His promise—"Lo, I am with you always," and sending down day by day His Holy Spirit to enlighten men to accept salvation. The memorable words of St. Luke concerning Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul," convey the inner history of every true Christian conversion. Paul laboured, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. No human causes, no secondary agencies alone, will

explain the victory of Christianity over sin and heathenism. We must claim that the introduction of a first cause, of the direct miraculous agency of God the Holy Ghost, present in and with His Church, is required to explain the Christian victory, by the necessities of historical criticism, as well as by the gratitude of Christian piety, and I am far from sorry to embrace the opportunity, upon this Whit Sunday, in this our brief study of Christian Missions, to honour the Divine Spirit by recognising the necessity of His interference as the only means of any real living, regenerating power in the Christian religion or the Christian Church.

But now, though we depreciate the influence of the causes above assigned as insufficient to explain the success of Christianity, and assert the necessity of perpetually holding in view the living supernatural presence of the Holy Ghost in and with the Church, you may justly claim from me that I shall at least state what were the agencies used by the Church, which God was pleased so to bless to the conversion of men. I answer briefly, that the Church strove to conserve and to spread, in its integrity, the body of doctrines, of rites, of institutions, which she had received as a sacred deposit from the Apostles. To speak generally, the method of early missions was to plant the Church in large towns, and from them to diffuse its influence into the surrounding districts. First, Christianity was a converted life in human souls; a new creation wrought in clergy and laity by the Holy Ghost. The Church thus founded, and governed by lawfully constituted bishops and pastors, met for common worship. Weekly they were joined to the Lord, and He to them in the Holy Sacrament of His passion; and thus, partly by example, partly by teaching, partly by social influence, occasionally by literature, the Christian brethren spread the knowledge of Christ in ever-widening circles.

If we may select one as pre-eminently the means by which Christianity made its footing so sure, we should specify the example of reverent good sense shown in the discipline imposed upon Catechumens, or heathen candidates for baptism. These were placed under Christian instruction for two whole years, and carefully trained (the catechisms then used still exist in the Apostolical Constitutions and in the elder Cyril) before they were admitted to this Sacrament. You would almost suspect (if you did not know the contrary) that the Church depreciated the sanctifying effect of baptism by this delay in the administration of it. But the cause was that Christians, while not undervaluing sacraments and rites, felt that faith must rest on knowledge, on rational, intelligent training. So Christianity, instead of being a temporary, spasmodic influence, laid a firm grasp upon the intellect and character of its converts. I insist on this the more because we shall have occasion hereafter to revert to the neglect of this grave

precaution as one of the great causes of the ephemeral character of the Romish mission of the saintly Xavier in India. The early Church owed under God the solidity of its victorious progresses to this precaution of founding Christian faith and Christian education. Thus working, Christianity gradually spread itself. By the third century it had made a very deep and large impression upon the world. The number of Christian graves in the Roman catacombs, in the second and third centuries, though most absurdly exaggerated, is, in all soberness, not less than two hundred thousand. By the year 300, when the last and keenest of the persecutions (the Diocletian) seemed about to overwhelm the Church—a persecution directed against churches, sacred books, clergy and laity, with biting barbarous ferocity—the Christians were so numerous that there is reason to compute that no less than 60,000 sacred books were destroyed by the persecutors; and when, a few years later, under Constantine, the Church finally obtained toleration and protection, an appreciable minority of the the Roman world was already Christian; and in the century that followed, *i.e.*, by A.D. 400, the Church, having rest, succeeded in spreading its influence over the population which still remained unconverted, and prepared itself for bringing into the fold of Christianity and orthodoxy the varied peoples of the Northern races which overran the south of Europe, and which, settling there, formed a new ingredient in the population.

Such is the history of Christian missions in the first of the four periods into which I divided the subject. The mustard seed had grown into a great tree.

2. This mention of the conversion of the Teutonic and Gothic peoples who settled in the Roman world is the appropriate preface to the history of the Church's mission for the conversion of their brethren dwelling in the countries of northern Europe—England, Germany, Russia. We have seen the victory of Christianity over adult, somewhat effete, civilization. Let us watch its new campaign against uncivilized life; the unsophisticated simple qualities of liberty-loving barbarians. It had purified the former. Could it tame and sanctify the latter?

It was in the seventh century, when the Mohammedan heresy was tearing away country after country from Christendom in the south and east, that the balance was redressed by vigorous attempts made for the conversion of the north. England was the first scene of work and triumph. The conversion of England may be taken as a type of all. The most eminent of the various agents to whom it was due were Augustine, who just before A.D. 600 introduced Christianity, and Theodore, who about 670 consolidated the Christian Church. The doctrine came from the one; the system of Church organisation and ethics from the other.

There were in this period of Christian missions contrasts as well as parallels to the former which we studied. For (to speak generally) the early English missionaries gained the ear of some chieftain, and, through him, influenced his tribe. The tribe embraced Christianity, like its leader. The process visible in the modern conversion of New Zealand illustrates the method which was used in England. In the early ages Christianity had begun from below, and worked upwards until it vanquished the throne; in the Teutonic nations it first got hold of the throne, and then worked downwards until it reached the people. In the one Christianity was persecuted, unestablished and unendowed. In the other, Christianity was only slightly persecuted, and was soon established and endowed. Nevertheless, its permanent success depended not upon this circumstance of its endowment, but upon the very two self-same causes which operated in the early Church—viz., a Christian doctrine and Christian institutions. In their inner essence these Christian missions, now described, are identical with those of the Church of the Fathers. And by the blessing of God's spirit on this agency, Christian nations were gradually in the course of ages trained in Northern Europe, as Christian people had been previously formed in the south. By the year 1300 all Europe was nominally converted to Christianity; and the missionary spirit slumbered, save as hopes were excited of recovering Mohammedan countries to the faith. But about A.D. 1500 the world was startled by the geographical discoveries which lifted the curtain concealing the other hemisphere; and devout minds longed to tell the teeming millions of other continents concerning the salvation through Jesus. The Roman Catholic Church used three methods for bringing these realms within the fold: the method of conquest in Mexico and Peru, about 1520; the method of missionary preaching under the Jesuit Xavier in India and Japan, about 1550; and the method of Christian colonization by the Jesuits in Paraguay, about 1600. Of these the second alone is analogous to the missionary attempts heretofore described; and to it alone time compels me to restrict myself.

3. The career of Xavier is an exciting chapter of Church history. It links itself with the history of the Jesuits, on the one hand, and with Christian missions on the other.

A Spanish officer, Ignatius of Loyola, lying wounded in a hospital, vowed in penitence to become only a soldier of Jesus Christ. Henceforth he spent his life in waging war, first against the sinfulness of his own heart, and secondly, against the sins of society around; and with a view to the latter object he organised, about 1540, the little battalion of soldiers of Jesus, hence called the Jesuit order. Its founder felt that these new Crusaders must act against the religious

anarchy of Europe, but must also go forth to conquer for Christ the newly discovered Eastern Indies. For this purpose, he sent forth his comrade Xavier, a man of saintly enthusiasm, of heroic self-devotion; a cavalier of Christ, a true red cross knight. During a period of ten years (viz. 1542-1552), coinciding with the close of the reign of our Henry VIII. and with the reign of Edward VI., Xavier made and baptised hundreds of thousands of converts in Southern India and Japan, and was about to carry the Cross into China when he was called to his eternal rest.

What, we ask, was the permanent result of his labours? We must reply, almost nothing. His life's work was not a solid conquest; it resembled rather the fiery passage of one of the great Eastern conquerors; he scathed heathenism by the fury of his career; he effected no solid suppression of it. Now, allowing that his scheme failed in part through want of support, through his being insufficiently followed up by successes, let us ask whether there was not some defect in his original plan which forbade permanent success; some defect, in fact, which partly explained the superficial nature of his primary success. His plan was missionary preaching, in the bazaars, in the street; often in broken accents. His hearers caught the enthusiasm; the phenomena of a religious revival occurred in the Hindoo population, then unaccustomed to the voices of Christian missionaries. I dispute not Xavier's ecstatic piety. I doubt not that a spiritual presence, an unearthly sanctity, so attended him as to arrest the attention of the dullest; and it may seem an impertinence to criticise where we ought rather to admire. But the fact that his work was a failure is nature's own condemnation of it. To some of you, perhaps, it may appear that no other cause of failure need be sought than the fact that the religion which Xavier spread was the Romish form of Christianity. This is hardly satisfactory, and yet of course there is from our point of view a relative truth in such a statement. For to speak frankly, brethren, there are two sides to Roman Catholicism. View the Romish Church in its illustrious orators, its great saints, its quiet cloisters, its refined art; take a Catholic country like the Tyrol, and contrast the simple virtues of its Christian peasantry with the God-forgetting Protestantism of the Calvinistic Swiss cantons; and you will regard the Romish Church as being the nursery of piety, the home of poetry, the abode of taste. But, on the other hand, take popular Popery; notice its invocation of saints, the prevalence in it of image-worship; its almost deification of the Virgin; its proclamation of indulgences, the Antinomian misuse of the confessional; its services in an unknown tongue, masked, too, from the people by inaudible recitation; read its history, remark its worship of a grand Lama, the Pope; its ferocity in persecuting; and you see a system which is practically in peril

of becoming a hindrance to civilisation, and a cheat to the human soul; which has really, in the process of ages, so absorbed into itself elements of heathenism, as to have well nigh transformed itself into it. Now, Xavier himself was a Catholic of the former type; but the Catholicism which he was able to spread among the Hindoos hardly rose above the latter. Yet, why not? Where was the defect in Xavier's plan? The defect seems to have been this. He preached Christianity instead of planting the Church. Perhaps, being alone and unaided, he had no other resource; but the result was unfortunate. He hastily baptised excited crowds of religious inquirers, instead of adopting the old church system of instructing them by a prolonged catechuminate for receiving holy baptism. His method was that of the Jesuit revival; not the old method of the primitive Church; and hence his converts disappeared; his work was ephemeral. Not even a thin layer of Christian influence was spread over Hindoo society; the seed not having any depth of earth withered away. Such is briefly the early history of the great Roman Catholic movement of missions. Omitting all notice of its subsequent progress, let us turn to the fourth period of missionary history, viz., the work effected by the reformed Communions, or rather that effected by our own Church; for we have not time to speak of the great missionary heroes of other communions, Lutheran, Moravian, and Non-conformist.

It is odd to state that the first person who formed a scheme of missions for the Reformed Church was Oliver Cromwell. This soldier-statesman drafted a plan for creating a great board of Protestant Missions, a Protestant Propaganda. Missions were a matter to be conducted by a bureau at Whitehall, managed by a staff of clerks. But his death cut short this droll experiment of "Satan casting out Satan." It was not the design of Providence that the mantle of missionary enterprise should fall on a blood-stained warrior. About fifty years later the instruments appeared: God awakened the hearts of a few devout churchmen to found in London a "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," i.e., in modern language, a missionary society for planting the Church of England in the British colonies and dependencies. The mercantile marine of England was then rapidly developing. She was becoming a colonial power, and on the way to become the rival of her great colonising predecessors, Portugal, Spain, and Holland. A few devout clergy, therefore, in spite of much coldness in the Church at home, felt the need not only of energetically carrying on home missions in London, but also of providing the ordinances of the Church for the children of the English dispersion; and they accordingly got their Missionary Society formed by Royal Charter in 1701, in close connection with the Church, and in strict obedience to the Episcopal administration.

Amid the torpid Erastianism of the last century, it was only now and then that some enthusiastic spirit, like Wesley in Georgia, and Bishop Berkeley in Bermuda, gave itself up to missionary life; but before the end of the century it pleased God, by means of that body of Christ-loving clergy who called themselves Evangelical, to revive spiritual religion in our Church; and, about the year 1800, some devout clergy and laymen of that school, communing with God in their villas on the heaths of Surrey, founded a new missionary society, called the "Church Missionary Society," whose object was not the Gospel for the colonies, but for the heathen, for Africa and the East, as they expressed it; for the tortured Africa, of which Wilberforce had assumed the advocacy, and for India, the great dependency which Providence had just committed to England's trusteeship. This Society differed from the Propagation Society, not only in its sphere, but also in its constitution, in that it was not strictly a Church society, bound to subject its acts and its missionaries to the Church and to Episcopal supervision, but was rather a society of churchmen, the ultimate management of whose missionaries and affairs was in a committee in London, not necessarily, except by *concordat*, obedient to the Church and the Bishops. Such an independent plan has its value as well as its disadvantages, and I name it now not in criticism, but merely as an historic fact, and great deeds has this late-born Society done for Christ. One of its best known early friends, whose life justly awoke a moral sympathy for the Society and for its object, was the learned, the saintly, the heroic missionary, Henry Martyn; the Coryphæus of missionaries from Cambridge, the prototype of the missionaries whom your University has had the honour recently to send to Delhi.

Thus, then, these two missionary Societies, the one the expression of the Church's sympathy on behalf of our colonists, at the year 1700, the other, on behalf of the heathen, brought into contact with the English dominion, at the year 1800, are the sister institutions which act in the name of our Church upon the conscience of the heathen. They are sisters, I say, and it is only unwise friends of each who represent them as rivals, and thus introduce strife. If you choose, you can place them at enmity by your rhetorical contrasts. You can describe the elder society as setting the Church above the Gospel; the younger as setting the Gospel above the Church; the one as Ritualist, the other as Evangelical; the one as the slave of system, the other as elastic and free; the one as emphasizing missionaries, the other as emphasizing the Bible; the one as leading men to Christ through the Church, the other as leading men to the Church through Christ. But the best proof that such a contrast is unfair or overdrawn is that it is not generally apparent to the missionaries of the two societies when they work together abroad.

The quarrel, brethren, has been generally confined to the barrack-life at home; the two troops, when in front of the enemy, know no rivalry save that of striving to push forward the standard of Christ.

We believe in the substantial soundness of the work of both Societies, because they proclaim an indissoluble wedlock between the Gospel and the Church; they adhere to the faith and missionary practice adopted by the early Church, on which we have seen God has stamped the approval of His providence in all ages of missionary enterprise.

Our rapid survey of the four great periods into which we divided the history of missions is completed, and I trust that the effect left on our minds by it will be to show us that the work of missions is hopeful, and to cheer us in the duty of diffusing Christianity. If the work is real we may labour in the assurance that future generations will see a harvest reaped from the seed which is now being scattered.

But I wish, before concluding, to allude briefly to the painful doubt to which I before referred, which haunts many minds and chills their sympathy for Missions,—viz., the suspicion that in these modern times, just described, missionaries are compelled to take up a different attitude towards heathen religions from that which was formerly deemed fit. The fact is undeniable; but it need not create alarm. The comparative study of religion has placed Christianity in its true perspective in relation to o'her creeds. It has shown their excellence as well as their defects. The heathen religions are the only training which Providence affords to guide the great mass of the human race to the eternal world. It is now generally felt that the Father of mercies cannot have ushered millions of His children on to this planet merely to be lost eternally. Accordingly the condemnation of the heathen is an idea now generally regarded as no longer tenable. Yet, if so, why teach Christianity to them? If their ignorance be bliss, why increase their moral responsibility? Now let us concede that God will judge the heathen according to the light which they have; and let us concede, too, for the sake of argument (which, however, we know is not the case), that the various heathen creeds yield the maximum of good capable of being produced by them with only the minimum of evil; let us suppose too that their devotees, their seekers after God, are really fearing God and working righteousness, and therefore, like Cornelius of old, accepted of God; would Christianity, we demand, be on this account valueless to them? Let the history of the heathen Cornelius give us the answer to this question. He was approved by God; yet he was so far from reaching the highest perfection attainable, that God, as a reward for his goodness and sincerity, used miraculous means to instruct him in the way of righteousness more perfectly. All sincere religion is true religion, but it is not

necessarily perfect religion. So if heathen religions have their excellency; if Christianity can submit to surrender somewhat of the claim of exclusive truth formerly arrogated for it; yet so long as Christianity contains truth more perfect in every degree than other creeds, so long as it shall be the means of raising one human soul, one Cornelius, to a perfection to which he could not otherwise attain, so long will it be our bounden duty and unspeakable privilege to preach Christianity among the natives. Brethren, we see our calling; yet our consciences will tell us that we shall have no abiding interest in missions, unless we know the blessedness of being raised by Christ from our own sins; and unless the flame of love be kindled by the Holy Spirit on the altar of our hearts, to burn with inextinguishable blaze for the divine glory. It may be counted as a mark that God has revealed His Son in us, if we have been awakened to feel a real interest in missions, and to bestow on them our sympathy and prayers.

It may be counted too as one of the many grounds of hopefulness in reference to the future of our Universities, that a missionary spirit, such as the founders of the sermon longed for, has been lately aroused in them. Though the primary object of a University is of course the encouragement of knowledge and the affording mental discipline to men who shall enter various lines of life, yet it must be a cause of joy and thankfulness to those who feel an interest in the University training of our clergy, and in the progress of the theological branches of knowledge, to observe that, at the very time when the fears of many predict the unchristianizing of our Universities, and when attempts have been made to undervalue the Universities as nurseries for the future clergy, and to divert our students away from them into theological seminaries, not only has theological learning in its various branches made a substantial advance, but a spirit of religious earnestness and of missionary fervour has manifested itself. Happy will it be, brethren, for your University, if God shall be pleased so to pour down His Spirit on your students as to kindle in them the spirit of consecration to the missionary work. Nobler honour would it be to you; higher than the cultivation of the noblest knowledge, grander even than the providing an educated and godly clergy for the active populations of England's parishes, if you should be honoured by God to be made the instruments of training faithful soldiers of Christ to bear to heathen lands the banner of the Redeemer's cross. "Our Father which art in heaven, Thy kingdom come."

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has gone to Bel Alp, Switzerland, and will be absent for about a month.

NOTICES.

All communication respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1884.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

IN a transubstantiated object, as "Nebelstreif" informs us, there exist two things:—

1. The accidents—which include, in the case of a biscuit or piece of bread, everything that can be discerned by either sense or reason with respect to it—its appearance, feel, taste, smell, its nourishing properties, its ingredients, its chemical elements, etc., etc.

2. The supposed but unknown support of those accidents—of which no man can form the least idea what it is, but which, nevertheless, must be held to underlie the accidents, and to be locally present in them.

He thinks, also, that to worship the "accidents" is idolatry, while to worship "the supposed but unknown support of them" is not. And apparently he thinks it possible, while worshipping the Host, to separate mentally the "accidents" from their "supposed but unknown support," and thus to confine our adoration strictly to the latter, without allowing any of it to fall upon the former. If we, in any way, mistake his notion, he will be good enough to correct us. If this is his view, we would venture to ask, What reason has he for thinking that this innermost substance of the object has been changed at all? Why does he suppose that "the supposed but unknown support of the accidents" is a different thing in the consecrated bread or wafer from what it was in the same object before consecration? The only reason is certain words of our Saviour, which theologians insist on interpreting literally, instead of permitting them to share with most of His other words the nature of a parable. If the parabolical or metaphorical interpretation be adopted, there is no difficulty and no mystery, and no need to introduce this fine distinction between the "accidents" and

"their supposed but unknown support." And this is the simple fact; there is no difficulty and no mystery, except such as the theologians have introduced in attempting to be profound; and therefore no need for the fine distinction between the substance and the accidents. The meaning of the expressions, "eating the flesh of Christ" and "drinking His blood," is best determined by a comparison of a passage of Scripture, in which they occur, with other parallel ones. Let us take the following answers to the question, Who hath eternal life? and see whether the metaphorical phrase which comes last is not interchangeable with the literal phrases which precede it, and, like them, expresses a mental and spiritual, not a material action.

John iii. 36.	ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν	} ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον
v. 24.	ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων, καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με	
vi. 40.	ὁ θερῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν	
47.	ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ	
54.	ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα	

Here "eating the flesh of Christ" and "drinking His blood" are metaphorical expressions, which equal the literal expressions, "beholding Him," "believing Him," and "hearing His word." The whole process described by each phrase alike is mental and spiritual. In the same manner "the body and blood of Christ" are not "the supposed but unknown support of His accidents," but His moral qualities, His character, His principles, His teaching, His saving grace, His spirit—what He has done, what He has said, and what He is—in fact all in Him and of Him which faith can appropriate. And the bread and the wine are the signs and memorials that He is thus the true support and nourishment of the soul. Our correspondent "Nebelstreif" seems to us to commit the very common error of mistaking obscurity for depth. When a man has puzzled himself, and raised before his mind a conception which he finds himself perfectly unable to grasp, he forms a high idea of his own altitude and profundity, and supposes that he has reached the empyrean, whereas in fact his captive balloon has only taken him a short excursion into *Nebelheim*. From that elevated region what is simple and plain seems shallow to him. The illustration from Goethe rather cuts the other way. The object which the child saw had all the accidents of a *Nebelstreif*—composition of watery vapour, dimness, damp, bitter cold; while "the supposed but unknown support of the accidents," which represented itself in the form of *Erlkönig*, was a creature of the child's imagination. Such, too, is the Real Presence, when supposed to be localised in a piece of bread—a creature of the imagination, which first obtained currency in popular superstitions, was then rationalised by the schoolmen, and at last petrified in a dogma.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—When quotations from the teaching of Our Lord are made by the early Fathers, such as Clement of Rome or Justin, we cannot assume immediately that any one of our Gospels which contains a similar passage is the source of the quotation. The elements common to two or three of our Gospels may have been common to many more, the authors of which had “taken in hand” to embody the evangelical history in written documents. Is it possible to reach anything beyond conjecture respecting the source or sources of Justin’s quotations, seeing that with one half-exception he never names any separate evangelical document as his authority? A comparison of our Gospels may help us to answer. For instance, where Matthew and Mark closely resemble each other in wording, and Luke diverges, it is probable that Matthew and Mark follow closely the words of the common original (whether oral or documentary) and that Luke’s words are his own. We can infer somewhat similarly that certain incidents in the history are drawn from a source peculiar to some one evangelist. A better explanation of the argument, however, may be the statement of it; let me, therefore, borrowing mainly from Sanday and Norton, give reasons for believing that Justin quoted our Gospel of St. Matthew. Dr. Sanday writes:—“Of those portions of the first Synoptic, which appear to be derived from a peculiar source, and for the presence of which we have no evidence in any other Gospel of the same degree of originality, Justin has the following: Joseph’s suspicions of his wife (Dial. 78), the special statement of the significance of the name Jesus, ‘For He shall save His people from their sins,’ (Ap. 33, where Justin makes some confusion between the narratives of Matthew and Luke) verbally identical; the note upon the fulfilment of the prophecy, Is. vii. 14, ‘Behold a virgin, etc.’ (Ap. 33 and Dial.), the visit of the Magi guided by a star, their peculiar gifts, their consultation of Herod, and the warning sent to them not to return to him, the massacre of the children at Bethlehem, fulfilling Jeremiah xxxi. 15, the descent into Egypt (Dial. 78; Magi said, however, to come from Arabia), the return of the Holy Family at the succession of Archelaus (Dial. 103). The temptations Justin gives in the order of Matthew (Perhaps Dial. 125, where the Temptation closes as in St. Matthew). From the Sermon on the Mount he has the verses v. 14 (?16, Ap. 16) 20 (Dial. 105) 28 vi. 1 (Ap. 15) vii. 15, 21 (Ap. 16), and from the controversial discourse against the Pharisees, xxiii. 15, (Dial. 122) 24 (Dial. 112) which are without parallels. The prophecy Isaiah xlii. 1-4, is applied (Dial. 135) as by St. Matthew alone. . . . The comment of the disciples upon the identification of the Baptist with Elias, Matt. xvii. 13 (Dial. 49) the sign of the Prophet Jonas, Matt. xvi. 1, 4 (Dial. 107) and the triumphal entry, the ass *with the colt* (Dial. 53), show a special affinity to St. Matthew; and, lastly, in concert with the same Evangelist, Justin has the calumnious report of the Jews, Matt. xxviii. 12-15 (Dial. 108) and the baptismal formula, Matt. xxviii. 19” (Ap. 61). To Dr. Sanday’s collection of instances of special

agreement between Matthew and Justin, add one in Dial. 100: “And one of His disciples who was before called Simon, He surnamed Peter, because he recognised Him to be Christ, the Son of God, according to the revelation of His Father.” Peter’s confession that Jesus was the Son of God is among the first three Gospels peculiar to Matthew, so is the statement that this confession was “according to the revelation of His Father,” and the opening words, “Simon he surnamed Peter, because” etc., probably refer to “Thou art Peter,” (see Matt. xvi. 16-18) I think there are about fifteen other instances of special affinity with St. Matthew (as far as I can judge from a translation of Justin) which Dr. Sanday nowhere includes. To return to Dr. Sanday: “At least one case of parallelism seems to prove almost decisively the use of the first Gospel. It is necessary to give the quotation and the original with the parallel from St. Mark side by side.

Justin Dial. c. 49.

‘Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα’ λέγω ἐξ ὑμῶν ὅτι Ἡλίας ἤδη ἦλθεν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ’ ἐποίησαν σὺν τῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. Καὶ γέγραπται ὅτι τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταί, ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

Matt. xvii. 11-13.

‘Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα’ λέγω ἐξ ὑμῶν ὅτι Ἡλίας ἤδη ἦλθεν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ’ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν [οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν.] Τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταί ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

Mark ix. 12, 13.

ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουθενωθῇ. ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ Ἡλίας ἐλήλυθε καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠέλον καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ’ αὐτόν.

Dr. Sanday, among verbal coincidences with Matthew, or with readings found in early copies of Matthew, notes the remarkable word *ἀγγαρεύσει* seeming to be from v. 41, and about thirteen other verbal coincidences; but about five of these are with passages already enumerated. I hasten on, however, to speak of Justin’s coincidences with St. Matthew in quotation from the Old Testament, where both differ from the LXX. Justin twice quotes Micah v. 2; in both quotations he agrees with Matthew in the remarkable variation, “art not the least among the princes of Judah,” instead of “art least to be among the thousands of Judah;” and in one of these cases at least. (Ap. 34) Justin with Matthew, has “who shall feed” (*ποιμανεῖ*), instead of “to be ruler” (*τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα*), as it stands in the LXX. I have not seen the original Greek of the other passage in Justin (Dial. 78), but the translation before me says “who shall rule.” In one of Justin’s quotations of Zechariah ix. 9 (Ap. 35), he agrees with the LXX. against St. Matthew in the first part of the passage, but in the latter part he agrees with Matthew as against the LXX. in omitting *δικαίος καὶ σώσον αὐτόν*, and in reading *ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου*, instead of *ἐπὶ ὑποζυγίου καὶ πῶλον νέον*. In quoting Jeremiah xxxi. 15 (LXX., xxxviii. 15) Justin has (Dial. 78):

φανὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολλός Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπε παρακληθῆναι ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ. The LXX. has φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη θρήνον καὶ κλαυθμὸν καὶ ὀδυρμόν. Ῥαχὴλ ἀποκλειομένη ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῆς καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπε παρακληθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν.

"Justin agrees verbally with the quotation Matt. ii. 18, except that there, in the Received Text, *θρήνος* και is inserted before *κλαυθμός*; but these words Griesbach marks as probably spurious."—*Norton*.

I have loaded your columns with so much Greek, Mr. Editor, that perhaps it will be sufficient to explain of the fourth instance, viz., Justin's quotation of Isaiah xlii. 1-4 (in the Dial., ch. 123), that it has a very noticeable amount of agreement with St. Matthew, e.g., "Neither shall any man hear (the Greek words for "hear" used respectively by Justin and St. Matthew are different parts of the verb) his voice in the streets," instead of as in the LXX., "Neither shall his voice be heard without," and "I will put my spirit," instead of the LXX., "I gave my spirit." There are four other coincidences in the quotation as against the LXX. There are, it must be added, sentences in Justin's quotation both at the beginning and end that are not in Matthew's quotation, Justin in the opening sentence adopting the LXX. as against St. Matthew, and concluding as in the LXX., whether word for word or not in these two cases I do not know.

"What renders" the "coincidence with Matthew more remarkable is that it disappears when Justin repeats the quotation (Dial. 135), except in the single instance of the word *τυφόμενον*. When Justin made his first citation we may suppose that he quoted from memory, and that the words of the Evangelist recurred to him more readily than those of the Septuagint."—*Norton*.

If any one should suggest that, in the first of these coincidences of quotation, Justin and the first Evangelist have both learned some popular version of a text commonly quoted, I admit that, viewing the coincidence by itself, the thing supposed is perfectly possible. I make the same admission in regard to the second quotation. I should hesitate more to admit the probability in regard to the passage about "Rachel weeping for her children," for I doubt if the passage would have come much into popular use, had it not been quoted by St. Matthew. In the fourth case of coincidence, I admit again that in itself the hypothesis of a popular form of quotation is admissible.

I claim, however, that the probability has diminished very appreciably when all four coincidences in quotation are added together; the probability, I mean, that all the four have arisen without any dependence of Justin on Matthew.

Add to these the coincidences with the narrative of Matthew's Gospel, such as the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the innocents, etc. (see above). Is it still likely that Justin wrote independently? Add the marked agreement even to particles in the passage about John the Baptist, where the wide difference from St. Mark gives a likelihood that the words were specially those of the first Evangelist, and not those of the common oral or documentary source. I believe the opinion now in favour is that Mark is generally nearest the original form of the narrative: but let this be an exception; suppose Justin and Matthew have each preserved the original or some special form of the passage, even to the particles, without dependence of one writer on the other.

Add all the special affinities of Matthew and Justin in reporting the words of our Lord. It may be said, perhaps, that these are taken from a collection of the discourses consulted independently by Justin and the first Evangelist. Each of these suppositions may perhaps be admitted separately; but the chances

against all together seem little short of infinite, if so inaccurate an expression may be pardoned. A mind that can steadily view all these phenomena of special agreement, and still hold that Justin knew nothing of our Gospel of St. Matthew, might be called ultra-credulous, only that it is hard to say in what direct or circumstantial evidence the credence is placed. But the improbabilities of such a view are not yet exhausted. Are we further to suppose that every form of Matthew's Gospel known to Papias, the contemporary of Justin, perished about this time—alike the Hebrew Gospel and its interpretations, bequeathing, however, a name to our first Gospel, and that the source or sources of Justin's information, containing so many coincidences with St. Matthew, also perished, bequeathing the materials above enumerated to our first Gospel; that one parent died bequeathing a name, and the other bequeathing a fortune? While in the next generation, or scarcely in that, if we reckon Tatian, our first Gospel had become established nearly as firmly as in the present day.

The Gospel of St. Mark has so few incidents peculiar to itself (only two miracles, for instance) that the reader ought not to be surprised to hear that the evidence for Justin's use of Mark is scanty indeed compared to the evidence for his use of Matthew. We must carefully bear in mind, however, that Justin had not the slightest idea of leaving information for posterity as to what documents he used. The builders who laid the first stones of the Christian Church did not deposit contemporary journals and coins for the satisfaction of future antiquaries. The special affinities of Justin's account to St. Mark are only two (two others are suggested, but are far from clear), one of the two that I allege being the statement (Dial. 88) that Christ followed the employment of a carpenter, with which, however, Justin writes of Him, "making ploughs and yokes"—an addition also contained in the Apocryphal Gospel of Thomas. The other instance of special affinity is very important, inasmuch as it is Justin's nearest approach to specifying one particular Gospel as his authority. "And from His being said to have changed the name of one of the Apostles to Peter, and its being related in his" (i.e., apparently Peter's) "memoirs (*ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ*), that this was done along with His having also changed the names of two other brothers, the sons of Zebedee, into that of Boanerges, which is 'sons of thunder,'" etc. (Dial. 106). That James and John were called Boanerges is a statement found among our Gospels only in Mark (ch. iii. 17), and in the preceding verse it is said, "And Simon he surnamed Peter," a collocation in remarkable agreement with the above words of Justin, "that this was done along with his having changed the names," etc. (*γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο—μετωνομασθέναι*). The documents to which Justin appeals for his knowledge of the Gospel history are called by him "Memoirs of the Apostles," but never (I write on Norton's authority) "Memoirs of Christ;" it seems fair to infer that the "his" (*αὐτοῦ*) of "his Memoirs" refers to the author, not to the subject of the memoir; and Peter, as we know from Papias and others, was believed to be the source from which Mark derived his knowledge of the Gospel history.

"In common with St. Luke, Justin has the mission of the angel Gabriel to Mary (Dial. 100), the statement that Elizabeth was the mother of John (Dial. 84), that the census was taken under Cyrenius (Dial. 78), that Joseph went up from Nazareth to Bethlehem,

δοεν ἦν (Dial. 78), that no room was found in the inn (Justin, however, says, Dial. 78, "in the village"), that Jesus was thirty years old when He began His ministry (Dial. 88), that He was sent from Pilate to Herod (Dial. 103), with the account of His last words (Dial. 105). There are also special affinities in the phrase quoted from the charge to the Seventy" (Luke x. 19—words spoken on the *return* of the Seventy, Dial. 76), "in the verse Luke xi. 52 (Dial 17), in the account of the answer to the rich young man" (better perhaps, the words spoken to the disciples, Luke xviii. 27, Ap. 19), "of the institution of the Lord's Supper" (Apol. 66, cf. Dial. 41 and 70; but there seems to be about the same affinity with 1 Cor. xi), "of the agony in the garden (Dial. 103), and of the resurrection" (Ap. 50, Dial. 53 and 106, as to His expounding the Scriptures after His resurrection) "and ascension" (Sanday).

Except, however, that the Ascension is mentioned (Ap. 51), I have not discovered any special affinity with Luke on this subject, Dr. Sanday adds that "the remand to Herod in all probability belonged to a source that was quite peculiar to" the third Evangelist.

"There are some marked coincidences of phrase in the account of the Annunciation—ἐπέρχεται, ἐπισκιάζειν, δύναμις ὑψίστου (a specially Lucan phrase), τὸ γινόμενον (also a form characteristic of St. Luke), ἰού, συλλήλην ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν."

Of instances where Luke varies, in his wording of a parallel passage, from Matthew and Mark (who are in comparative agreement), thus raising a probability that the words belong especially to Luke himself, and not to the original account from which the three Evangelists drew, Dr. Sanday notices Luke xviii. 27, and a more remarkable instance still—Luke xx. 35, 36, where occur the word ἰσάγγελοι (probably Luke's own coinage) and the "remarkable phrase," υἱοὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως (sons of the resurrection), for which latter Justin has, τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Dr. Sanday adds seven or eight other instances; but a detailed statement seems scarcely necessary, if it be remembered that the existence of our third Gospel in Justin's time is now an admitted fact. Marcion was a contemporary of Justin, and is mentioned by him (Ap. 26) as "even now teaching his disciples," etc. Marcion edited a Gospel which was our third Gospel in a mutilated form. This belief as to the origin of Marcion's Gospel was contested by the author of "Supernatural Religion," but I read in Dr. Wace's pamphlet that, yielding to Dr. Sanday's arguments, the author has now admitted that our third Gospel existed in Marcion's time (*circa* A.D. 140). Few, therefore, will doubt, one would hope, that Justin's marked verbal and historical coincidences with our third Gospel were derived from our third Gospel itself, rather than from the Mrs. Harris of ultra-sceptical criticism—the lost Gospels (I do not of course doubt their having existed), which can be conveniently supposed to have said almost anything required. Let us remember Justin's affirmation (Dial. 103) that the Memoirs were "written by the Apostles and those who followed them," in exact agreement with the titles and traditional authorship of the canonical four. Further, Justin's differences from our Gospels suggest later development from the history which they contain; the fire kindled on the Jordan at the time of the Baptism and the cave of the Nativity seem like apocryphal additions; his bringing the Magi from Arabia seems to be one of the efforts (such as the

familiar legend that makes them three kings) to find in the Gospel narrative a fulfilment of the 72nd Psalm (see verse 15); the ploughs and yokes, "by which He taught us both the tokens of righteousness and activity of life," seem like a popular homiletic comment on the history; and the derivation of Christ's descent from David through Mary may be an attempt to escape from an obvious difficulty (cf. Sanday).

I cannot leave the subject of Justin without remarking that his inaccuracy of quotation from the Old Testament, and the common style of early Christian quotation from the Old Testament, even (let me not be thought to doubt their inspiration) in New Testament writers, serve to bring out a point of capital importance in the present discussion, viz. that, though from scarcity of written documents, memory may have been then more exercised than now (one now and then hears of remarkable powers of memory among our own peasantry), still memory was not in the early days of Christianity trained to the degree of escaping from its natural imperfections. Now there are instances in our Lord's teaching where there is more or less difficulty in tracing the connection of ideas, and it may be urged that in some of these cases connecting sentences have been forgotten. Make deductions on this account if you think it necessary, but I think it will be difficult to doubt that our Lord's teaching has reached us in a high state of preservation. I would particularly invite attention to this internal evidence for the early date of our Gospels. Could oral tradition, unassisted by writing for seventy or eighty years, have given us the Sermon on the Mount or the Parables? Could it have flowed clear through the sub-Apostolic controversies? I hope that in any discussion in your columns on the date of the Gospels this consideration will not be lost sight of.

I have already mentioned, in stating the arguments for the genuineness of St. Luke the widespread reception of the Gospels at the end of the second century, shown by testimonies from Asia Minor, Alexandria, Carthage, and (probably) Italy. I must refer your readers to Dr. Sanday's pages for a further argument proceeding from this, viz. that in Irenæus, in Clement of Alexandria, and in Tertullian the text of the Gospels appears with alterations from that which the text critics regard as authentic, alterations of which Dr. Sanday believes we can partly trace the lineage by a comparison of MSS. and versions, and which seem by probable inference to push back the period of the original autographs to about the date claimed by the orthodox. A similar argument is used by him with reference to the state of the text in Marcion. I cannot but think also that the use of the Gospels by the heretics of the second century, as of Luke by Marcion, as apparently of Luke (and John) by the Basilidians, of apparently all four Gospels by the Valentinians, etc., and if we can place confidence in the date, in the second century, commonly assigned to the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, etc., the use of all four Gospels by Ebionites, furnishes a probability not only that our Gospels had been some time written, but that they had for some time been *established in general recognition*, and this established recognition seems to push back the time of writing still further.

To sum up the arguments I have put forward. I began by enumerating several convergent lines of evidence that seem to me to establish the Lucan

authorship of the third Gospel. These I recapitulated in your issue of May 31st. (I am not ignoring "F. T. P.'s" objections to one of my seven points, but I hope to write further on that subject). I then urged the probability that the first and third Gospels belong to about the same period—a period (see Luke's preface) of numerous written Gospels; and that the similarity of parts of these Gospels seems to imply a common original established before the dispersion of the Apostles from Jerusalem—a probability further supported by an advance in Christological language in the sections peculiar to St. Luke; I mean his more frequently saying "the Lord" instead of "Jesus," the latter being more natural while His life on earth was more recent.

Lastly, I have been endeavouring to show that these antecedent presumptions receive abundant support from external evidence, which indeed I have not stated quite exhaustively.

The comparatively humble position of Matthew, Mark, and Luke in the Apostolic Church seems to give the assignment of Gospels to them a further presumption in its favour. Pausing now for discussion, I hope in two months or six weeks, if your columns should still be open to me, to complete my argument with the evidence for the genuineness of the fourth Gospel.

ERIGENA.

[The parenthetical references to Justin's sections are put in by me.]

A FOREIGNER UPON OUR MORTUARY CUSTOMS.

SIR,—It is alleged that, of all peoples, the Americans are the most sensitive to foreign criticism. This may be true or not, but it may safely be affirmed that each nationality possesses its *amour propre*, so to speak, and while it will patiently put up with upbraidings from members of its own society, it will not brook the censures of strangers with the same degree of *sang froid*. Recently a gentleman, who signs himself Fernan de Azala, wrote to the *Times* animadverting upon our mortuary customs and the unreverential and insanitary manner in which the dead are disposed of in our London cemeteries. The indignant correspondent mentions how he had become an ardent and strong admirer of cremation, and proceeds to detail how his conversion had been effected. It was in this wise. He happened, with his wife, to attend a funeral in one of our West-end cemeteries. Although the grave was not bricked, nevertheless the stench which emanated from it "horried him." It sickened his wife, who continued ill up to the time of his writing. No wonder, indeed, that such an occurrence took place, for falling sick while attending funerals in London is more general than many people suppose. It appears that the open grave referred to by Mr. Azala happened to contain five relatives of the new tenant, and that the inscription on the plate of the upper coffin was distinctly visible, owing to the quantity of earth removed. This pestilence-creating practice of placing a number of bodies, with scarcely a shovelful of earth—if the London clayey soil can be so called—between them, is not limited to one cemetery. From official returns presented to the House of Commons I find that such is the general rule adopted. The perusal

of these papers makes one's blood run cold as horror upon horror is revealed. Why the very heathen, whom we seek to Christianise and civilise, would not tolerate such indignity being shown to their dead. Even of Kensal Green Cemetery, which is still, I believe, regarded as a fashionable necropolis, it may truly be averred that its walls enclose a huge mass of pollution. Although but seventy acres in extent, it is crammed with human remains, the Company, under the provisions of the Burials Amendment Act, not being restricted as to the number of interments even in a single grave. It is incumbent, however, that "a layer of earth twelve inches in thickness" shall be placed between each coffin, but it is as likely as not that this legal regulation is as often disregarded. By this shocking arrangement a grave, or "pit," sixteen feet six inches in depth will receive six bodies. But some graves are much deeper; so that their dead can be "stowed away" to any extent, irrespective of decency and regardless of the health of a densely crowded neighbourhood. One is tempted to say with the *Clown* in "Twelfth Night," "Will God give them wisdom that have it; and those that are fools, let them use their talents."

It is stated by one official authority (Mr. Loudon) that nearly all the new London cemeteries adopt the practice of interring a number of bodies in the same grave, and without leaving a sufficient depth of earth over each coffin. He even goes so far as to condemn their principles of management, the choice of sites, the nature of the soil, the drainage, the absence of precautions to prevent danger to the public health, and also the services of the *employés*. In pleasant contrast to this is the language of the late Dr. Sutherland, in his Report to the Secretary of State, namely, "At the present time the only Cemetery Company which combines in its practice a proper regard for public health and public decency is the London Necropolis Company. Their manner of conducting interments in their cemetery at Woking is as commendable as the practice of the other companies is the contrary." This testimony is only just on the principle of giving honour to whom honour is due. It is painful to think that a foreigner has to rally us for our crass system of sepulture, the reckless manner in which the dead are thrown into pits, and the morbid indifference manifested to the living. Cremation has gained another supporter in consequence; and that is all. Neither this fresh exposure nor the bad cemeterial system itself will do much towards arousing the apathetic public sentiment, which, if it but manifested itself, would move the hands of the Home Secretary and cause a beneficial change. It is simply useless to propose recourse to cremation. What is needed is the closing of the overcrowded burying-places all around London, the prohibition of interment near cities, and the general adoption of sanitary earth-to-earth burial.

CLERICUS.

THE new Dean of Carlisle (Dr. Henderson) has taken up his residence at the deanery, and on Sunday afternoon preached his first sermon in the presence of a large congregation.

DISTRIBUTING prizes at Macclesfield Grammar School lately, the Bishop of Chester remarked that he had not gone there to perform any Episcopal function, and would prefer to pose before them as the

Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, a position which, singular though it might appear, he still held. It seemed to him that the history of the Macclesfield Grammar School was exceptionally interesting. It appeared to have rather exceptional characteristics, especially in the fact that it was a pre-Reformation school, for it dated back some forty or fifty years before the great mass of English grammar schools founded by Edward VI. and Philip and Mary, and therefore there was no taint of sacrilege affecting it. He thought we cast great discredit on our ancestors if we imagined that at certain periods in the history of this country a sudden flood of education burst upon the land, altering everything that had been going on before, and beginning a new period. He did not believe that was the case. He did not believe that before the Reformation, or later on, before school boards were established, people had forgotten their duties to their children, for they gave them the best education which was within their reach, taking into account the great difficulties which formerly existed in the way of communication, and other social, commercial, and literary difficulties which then affected not only education, but the whole fabric of English society. He did not believe that before 1504, when that school was established, nobody could read or write, for last week he examined the court rolls of a great manor, which showed him not only that people in those days could read or write, but that they could do both, and that they could write good Latin, and write in a way which put to shame the handwriting of many who had been trained in our modern schools. The great advantage of a study of classical languages was that the mind was so trained that a man who had mastered and got the whole benefit out of those subjects was qualified to take any subject in hand afterwards. That was the old system adopted in grammar-schools and in universities, and on the whole it answered very well; but like many other good systems it was pressed too far, and was even yet pressed too far in some regions of education. The two points which he had it on his conscience to strongly recommend to their notice were—first, of course, the study of history, especially the history of their own country; and, second, the study of German. The study of history was undoubtedly connected with all their interests, and had a most important bearing on their own future and the future of the country. A nation like England was not a nation that could be treated on the abstract principles of political economy. They ought to begin to study the history of their country at the beginning, to observe how our institutions had come into existence, and what the line of development was. He ventured to assert that if people had only begun to seriously study history at its beginning we should not see half the leading articles or hear half the violent speeches which were written or uttered at the present day. The other matter which he wished to urge upon them was the study of the German language. He did not wish to say one word of disparagement either of French or Latin, or of the study of English literature, for he was presupposing that any one who thought of approaching the study of a foreign language was at all events well acquainted with his own language or was making himself well informed in regard to the great writers who had made the English language and English literature a praise in the earth. But still he thought that both for purposes of culture and material prosperity the treasures of the next fifty

years were very largely to be found in a study of the German language and German books.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Berkeley, Rev. Sackville Hamilton, M.A., Vicar of Morebath, Devon; Perpetual Curate of St. James, Devonport.
 Berry, Rev. J. H., Chaplain to H.M.S. *Canada*.
 Collison, Rev. George Vaux, B.A., Vicar of Clodock.
 Dickson, Rev. W., Chaplain to the Devonport Dockyard.
 Fry, Rev. H. Lawrence, Curate of Christ Church, Ramsgate;
 Diocesan Temperance Organising Secretary, Canterbury.
 Hales, Rev. Greville Turner, B.A., Curate of Acklington;
 Rector of Bradwell, Essex.
 Hocter, Rev. John Francis, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Maghull.
 Jones, Rev. Alex. J., A.K.C., Curate of Acton Parish Church;
 Chaplain on the Ecclesiastical Establishment of Madras.
 Law, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Chepstow.
 Leighton, Rev. James, Rector of Christ Church, Harpurhey, Manchester.
 Lowndes, Rev. William, Vice-Principal of Ely Theological College.
 Phillips, Rev. James, M.A., Curate of Ormskirk; Chaplain of Orford, near Warrington.
 Pinckney, Rev. William John, M.A., Vicar of Quatford.
 Powell, Rev. Harcourt Morley Isaac, M.A., Vicar of Woollaston, Northamptonshire.
 Rose, Rev. R. O., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Staplefield Common.
 Rudall, Rev. Alfred, B.A., Vicar of Carnmenellis, Cornwall;
 Curate of Washford Pyne.
 Samler, Rev. William Surman Hadley, M.A., Vicar of South Stoke.
 Smith, Rev. Francis Arthur, Vicar of Woodford, near Byfield, Northamptonshire.
 Taylor, Rev. John, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Borrowdale.
 Taylor, Rev. Robert, Perpetual Curate of St. Faith's, Wandswoth.
 Thomas, Rev. George, B.A., Chaplain of Glamorgan Lunatic Asylum; Vicar of Newcastle, Bridgend.
 Turle, Rev. William, Honey, M.A., Vicar of Horsell.
 Walker, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Edstone.
 Ward, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Vicar of South Ossett, Ripon.
 Williams, Rev. J. L., Vicar of St. Mary's, Longfleet; Vicar of Great Canford.
 Williams, Rev. William, Rector of Dolgelly, Merionethshire.
 Willis, Rev. Newcombe, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Nul-ton; Rector of Ifield.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Barrow, Rev. George Staunton, M.A., late Vicar of Stowmarket-Suffolk, second son of the late Sir G. Barrow, Bart., at Davenport, Boscombe, Bournemouth, on the 10th inst., aged 49.
 Crabbe, Rev. George, at Merton Rectory, Watton, Norfolk, on the 9th inst., aged 65.
 Heslop, Rev. Thomas, Curate-in-Charge, at the Vicarage, Stanwick St. John's, Darlington, on the 9th inst.
 Jones, Rev. Hugh Hyndman, late Archdeacon of Demarara, at Houstoun Villa, Reading, on the 15th inst.
 King, Rev. Richard, at Pevensey, Sussex, on the 8th inst., aged 81.
 Knightley, Rev. Henry Charles, forty-five years Vicar of Combroke, and Compton Verney, Warwickshire, at Combroke, on the 14th inst., aged 70.
 Mather, Rev. Henry John, M.A., late Curate of Norton, at Norton, Bury St. Edmund's, on the 15th inst., aged 28.
 Miller, Rev. Charles, B.A., late Rector of Carlingford, at the Rectory, Carlingford, Louth, on the 8th inst., aged 77.
 Miller, Rev. Joseph Augustus, Vicar of St. Benedict's, Glastonbury, and formerly Vicar of Ile Brewers, near Taunton, on the 15th inst., aged 68.
 Morton, Rev. David, M.A., formerly for fifty years Rector of Harleston, near Northampton, at Ventnor, on the 2nd inst., aged 84.
 Rendell, Rev. Edward, B.A., Rector of Teigngrace, at the Lindens, Newton Abbot, S. Devon, on July 31, aged 74.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ROLLING YEARS.

BY THE REV. L. H. BRADFORD, M.A., CURATE OF
ST. PETER'S, EATON SQUARE.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. PETER'S, EATON SQUARE,
ON THE LAST SUNDAY OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

"We bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told."—PSALM xc. 9, P. B. V.

IF, my brethren, we require anything to impress the truth of these words upon our hearts, we have just now but to listen to the voice of the Church, or to look out upon the phenomena of nature, or to regard our own persons, and we shall see that they all teach the same lesson—that time and all things temporal are swiftly running their course, that the fashion of this world passeth away, that we bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told.

Here, in the house of God, we are listening to the Church's last lessons of the Christian year—the last of that long series in which she has unfolded to us the whole counsel of God. In her constant teachings she has reminded us of the work of the Blessed Trinity in our creation and redemption and sanctification. In her daily Offices she has given us opportunities of prayer and praise and thanksgiving. In the sacrament of the Holy Communion she has continually offered us the Bread of Life for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls. It has been a bountiful provision. But now, she would remind us, it is over. She has no more to reveal, no more to give. Whether we have partaken of it, or not, the feast of spiritual things has been spread for us, and now nothing is left us to do but to "gather up the fragments that remain."

And if we turn to the temple of Nature, there the handwriting is seen upon its walls, declaring in characters which all can read that we are bringing another year to its appointed end. Leafless trees, slanting shadows, shortened days, coldness, decay, and death proclaim, even to the most thoughtless and careless, that spring and summer and autumn are ended, and winter is with us again. These are signs of the times which none of us can fail to note.

But besides these witnesses we have another—that of our own bodies. With a kindness which we do not always appreciate, God does not allow the years to pass over us as the hands of a clock pass over its face, leaving no traces, making no

changes. Each round of the seasons leaves upon its mark, increases our stature and strength, develops our powers, matures our talents; or saps the springs of vitality, deepens the wrinkles, streaks the hair with silver, makes some definite change according as we are in the morning, the noontide, or the evening of life.

Oh! my brethren, that we would discern these signs of our times; that, instead of shutting our eyes to them, instead of trying to obliterate them with cosmetics and powder and paint, and all the miserable shams of a world which dare not face the thought of death, we would be content to grow old, we would be content to bring our years to an end, and catch from the swiftness with which they fly the thoughts they are meant to inspire!

"We bring our years to an end, *as it were a tale that is told.*" How strikingly true to experience! Look back over those that are gone. Recount what you can of their contents. You remember, perchance, the old home of your childhood with all its tender associations, your schooldays with their duties and companionships, your start in life with its hopes and trials; then the labours, successes, failures of maturer years, the snapping of old ties, the formation of new ones; the birth of a child; some accident, some illness, or when one dear to you as life itself was borne over your threshold to his long home; all that strange mixture of joys and sorrows that makes up the varied complexity—that forms the warp and woof of human life. And as our mind flashes back over the past, and in thought we live over again each incident, so short appears the interval since its occurrence that we exclaim, "It seems but as yesterday when it all took place." And now this is all we have left of those bygone times—a few memories that can soon be related, a few recollections which, as we grow old, we love to recall and linger over! The years are gone, with all their events; they can be summed up in a few sentences; they are brought to an end, literally, as it were a tale that is told. Such is life! "It is," as the Apostle reminds us, "even a vapour that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away."

How, my brethren, do these considerations affect us? We know how they affect the worldling who is without God and without hope. He is filled with dismay at the thought of the transitoriness of earthly things and the shortness of human life. But we Christians, my brethren, what are the sensations which we experience, as, at the close of another year, we are impressed with the fact that time is passing and death is approaching?

At first, probably, the reflection tinges our mind, as well as that of others, with a sense of regret and melancholy. These are not the only nor the dominant sensations we experience, but it is natural that they should have a place in our hearts. When the emigrant is about to leave his native land, with

the old home and familiar faces, to seek his fortune in, as he hopes, a brighter world, he does not break away from the scenes of early life, with their many links of love and association, without a pang. He feels that his going is for the best. Yet in the act of departing, as he leans over the bulwarks of the ship in which he is to sail, and takes his last look at the old country, his memory recalls all that is best and tenderest of the past, and his eyes are filled with tears, and his heart with sadness. So with the Christian and death. For him to die is gain. Thank God! he knows that. But to leave behind him so much that he has grown accustomed to, and learned to love—to go out into the unknown under circumstances so entirely new and strange as death necessitates—is a trial from which every healthy man must naturally shrink. But there are also other thoughts which stir within him—thoughts which elevate his soul, which invigorate his life, and show him what of himself is of supreme importance.

For, my brethren, strange as it may sound, the seeming shortness of his earthly life is a striking proof of his inherent dignity and worth. For what is it that makes our earthly life seem short? There are two things:—First, the knowledge that we are immortal. Were man the creature of a day, the narrow span of seventy years would seem to him eternity. To the tiny child who has no power of projecting himself into the future, but can only realise the present, the age of his white-haired grandfather appears almost endless. But as he grows older, and his mind expands, and his knowledge of himself deepens and widens, until he grasps the thought that his own being is to be co-extensive with the life of the Eternal God, with Whom a thousand years are but as one day,—so in proportion as he attains to this knowledge, does his earthly life dwindle down into insignificant dimensions. It is only when we can extend the horizon of our mind beyond the grave—can feel that the few years of our sojourn here are but the dawn of an endless day—that human life seems short. And so its shortness witnesses to our immortality.

There is yet another comfort in the thought. The swiftness with which the years appears to fly witnesses to our activity. To the idler, the lazy do-nothing, the wearisome hours of his vacant existence seem dull and long. They do not go fast enough for him. For him each moment comes and goes with leaden feet. He actually has recourse to all kinds of expedients for killing time. Like the lazy drone, the bee that makes no honey, he is worthless to society, deserving of being driven from the hive. No active man complains of the length of his days. For him they are too short. They pass too rapidly for all he wants to do. And so the apparent briefness of our life is, in a measure, a mark that we are doing work, a proof of our usefulness and of our inherent worth.

But besides the *consolation* we might derive from the idea of life's apparent briefness, it should have a direct influence, a *practical* bearing upon our thought and conduct. The swiftness with which the years close in should *intensify all our life and action*. It is a familiar fact that persons who come up from the country for a few weeks in the year often know much more about the sights and ways of London than do those who live here all their lives. Why is this? The Londoner thinks that he can see whatever he likes here at any time. There is no need for him to hurry here and there, as though the present were his only chance. The whole of his life lies before him. So he is always putting it off, and this often ends in his never seeing them. With our country cousins it is different. They know that their time here is short; they feel that they must make the most of it. Every moment is therefore occupied. They want to see everything worth seeing. They get about incessantly. They spare themselves no trouble; they give themselves no rest here. They can rest, they say, when they return home. Here they must make the best of their opportunity. My brethren, we may sometimes smile at the zeal and activity they show. With a pleasurable feeling of self-satisfaction at our own superior position and opportunities, we may good-temperedly humour them in their restless desire of being up and doing. But it would be well for us also to see in this a parable fraught with most useful instruction for us. Some of us live as though we thought we were to remain in this world for ever. We do not seem to realise that our sojourn here is short; but it is so. And we are here, not only to see the sights around us, but chiefly to accomplish the work which our heavenly Father has given us to do. Life is none too long for its performance. Ah! that we realized this! It is only by reminding ourselves that life is short that we can. We should look forward to eternity, working our very hardest now with the hope of resting then. If we live only in the present, with no thought of the future, life will appear long; we shall feel that we have no need to hurry, there will be plenty of time for all we have to do. We shall put off to-day's work for to-morrow, as though to-morrow had no work of its own. We shall grow dawdling and listless, and it will end in our work never being done. God forbid that that should be our case. At the present time we are being reminded of the swiftness with which the years are rolling by. Another has just gone. Let us make the most of what are left while we may. What God has appointed us to do, we must do with our might. Nothing must be blurred over; we are working for eternity, and we have but a short time in which to finish the work. If we grasp this truth, it will quicken our brains, nerve our arms, and intensify our whole life, and we shall realize the personal application of the Saviour's words, "I must work the works of Him

that sent Me while it is day; the night cometh, when no man can work."

Then, again, the sense of the near approach of death is calculated to enlarge and ennoble life. One of the most common faults of men is a tendency to pettiness and meanness, a disposition to waste their time in ways and occupations utterly beneath their dignity as sons of God. For instance, what a common failing it is with us to indulge in idle gossip, to cherish little grudges against each other, to say spiteful things of one another, to magnify our paltry grievances, to keep up those miserable misunderstandings which so frequently cause pain—to give way to a thousand pettinesses which in our hearts we are thoroughly ashamed of. We have a saying that, "Life is too short for quarrels." But most of us seem to be able to find plenty of time for the unhappy and unworthy occupation. Or, take another class of sins. Society is full of shams and silly pride. Scarcely anybody is content to appear what he really is. We gloss over our shortcomings. We hide our real characters from our nearest friends. We seldom acknowledge ourselves to be in the wrong. We are quick to take offence, too. We are always ready to stand upon our dignity. From our little social elevations we are constantly looking down upon our neighbours. My brethren, all this is exceedingly mean, and we must feel it to be so. And yet the lives of almost all of us are marred by some such failings. But at the approach of death they vanish. In the presence of that universal leveller, we dare not keep up those miserable feelings. When we lie upon our death-bed we are only too anxious to have done with them completely. There we are ready to make the fullest acknowledgment of any wrong we have done. Our great desire is to be at peace with all. Willingly we forgive, if only we may win forgiveness. The sense of immortality which death brings us frees our hearts and minds from the narrowing influences of earthly life, and encircles us with a larger and nobler atmosphere. And surely, my brethren, the close of another year, which reminds us of our coming end, should import into our present life something of the ennobling influence of death. It would be a happy thing if each of us determined that, with the help of God, the end of this year should be the end of all littleness and pride in ourselves and of all unkindness and misunderstanding in our relationships with others. None of us, I suppose, intend to die without making an effort to reform our lives in these particulars. But why should we delay the effort? Death may come at any moment without giving us the opportunity *then*. *Now* is the only time we can call our own. Let us make the effort now, and the whole of our future life will be happier, because nobler and more divine.

And there is another thought which is closely allied with those we have already considered, but which will perhaps enable us to see

the teaching of the passing year in a fuller and clearer light. We bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told. Life is short, and all the circumstances in which it is lived change and pass away. We brought nothing into the world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The soul goes back to God naked, stripped of all earthly possessions and distinctions. My brethren, does not this point us a most important truth, namely, that all that is of any real and lasting value is *self*—character. God looks, not to a man's position, not to what he has done, not to the possessions he has gained. These things are mere surroundings; they are transitory; they are left behind at death. God looks to what a man *is*; what he has *become* during life, good or bad. There is constant need of our bearing this in mind. We are so apt to form our opinions of men after the example of the world, and the world's opinion is often in contradiction to the declarations of God. As a rule, the world does not trouble itself much with men's personal characters: it simply asks what they are doing, or what property they possess, or what social position they occupy; and it metes out the adulation and homage that these attributes demand. Few of us have the moral courage to form independent judgment of people. We take the ready-made verdict of society. It saves time and trouble. Whether it be just or unjust, we do not stop to consider. A statesman who has climbed to place at the sacrifice of principle, a millionaire who has amassed his fortune by floating bubble companies, a duke whose immorality is notorious, all have their votaries in the fashionable world. But this is not all. We Christians too often acquiesce in this unworthy "toadyism." We allow our own views to be warped and confused until we value men rather for the mere accessories of their lives than for their moral and religious characters. Of course, my brethren, I am not wishing to disparage riches or social position for a moment. But we should look rather to the way in which men who have them *use* them, than at the things themselves. Soon they will be stripped of them, and stand before the Throne, and then they will be seen as they really are. We should be more helpful to the cause of Christ in the world if we formed our judgments of others, as far as we may, in the light that streams from that Throne, remembering always that of infinitely more importance than anything else is *character*.

Now let us give these thoughts a personal application. We bring our *years* to an end, but *we* outlast the end and live for ever. The activities in which we engage during life, the wealth which God has intrusted to our care, the position to which He has called us wherein to use our influence for Him, are but the materials with which He has furnished us to form our characters; not to be despised, but made use of; not to be exaggerated

and valued for themselves, but to be subordinated to their proper purposes.

If ever you have watched the building of some stately edifice intended to last for centuries, you will see at once what I mean. Year after year the building grows. Materials accumulate. The scaffolding is strengthened as it rises into the air. You can hardly see what it will be like for the surrounding stages and poles. At length the top-most stone is placed in position; the building is finished. All the scaffolding is stripped away, and the building stands confessed with whatever of beauty or ugliness the architect has endowed it. So it is with our souls. This life is the time for building them up. God has provided us with all that is necessary; He has left the planning of them and the execution of the plans to us. All the activities of life help to form our characters. All our surroundings are but the scaffolding materials. These will all be taken away when the building is complete. Of the building Christ is the foundation. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. "Some build with the gold of faith, with the silver of hope, with the imperishable costly stones of love; others, again, with the dead wood of unfruitfulness in good works, with the empty straw with a spiritless ostentatious knowledge, and with the bending reed of a continually doubting spirit." Each man's work shall be made manifest; for the day of Christ's appearing shall declare it. Be not anxious, troubled about many things that the world may think important—mere accessories of life; but make sure of the one thing needful, which shall not be taken away.

THE death of Sir Erasmus Wilson removes a type of eminent man in which the Church of England has been happily prolific. He had thoroughly earned his distinction as a Fellow of the Royal Society by successful investigations into a difficult and important branch of medical science, whereby he not only took a high place as a writer of text-books which have not been superseded by the labours of younger men, but had the more honourable fame of benefiting the public health and diminishing much suffering. He was a philanthropist who used wisely and liberally the wealth which his professional eminence brought in. His intellectual interests were not confined to medicine, for his "Egypt of the Past" is the best and most accurate popular summary of a difficult branch of erudition; and he was, in addition to all this, a zealous and open-handed Churchman, to whose bounty the sea-bathing infirmary at Margate owes not only a new wing, but its beautiful chapel, and Swanscombe the restoration of its church some eleven years ago. His last appearance in public before his death, full of years and honours, was at a Church ceremony; and though the general public are likely to remember him best as the man whose public spirit brought Cleopatra's Needle to London, after the State, whose property it had been since 1809, had let it lie neglected on the sands at Alexandria, his title to our grateful respect rest on a surer basis.—*Church Times*.

NOTICES.

All communication respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1884.

INFIDELITY.

AT the present time prominence is being given to the "burning" questions of the day, especially at Church Congresses and Diocesan Conferences; and one of the most important is,—What shall we do to counteract the Infidelity and scepticism of the present day? The religious world has been startled by the appearance of the *Bitter Cry of Outcast London*, and strenuous efforts are being made to make the Church's influence more felt upon the lives of the inhabitants of the slums of London,—and we trust not only in the metropolis, but in the courts and alleys of other large manufacturing towns. And yet the living agency, valuable and all-powerful as it is in all mission work, must be helped and supplemented in other ways, if we are to cope with the Infidelity which exists. For some years the Christian Evidence Society has been at work in sending out able lecturers, and distributing useful literature; and success has to a certain extent attended their efforts. Some years ago, in a large manufacturing parish in the north of England, it was felt by the clergy that something should be done to counteract the pernicious influence of certain atheistic lectures which were being delivered; and so it was arranged to have a course of Christian evidence lectures, which were largely attended by working-men who evidently took great interest in the subject. At the close of each lecture some one or other well-known advocate of the Infidel school got up and attempted to reply, but their answers were so extremely weak and faulty that they were soon glad to retire from the contest. It is plain that clear outspoken assertions, backed up by quotations from various authors, as to the truth of the Christian religion is what is required, and keen, hard-headed working-men who discuss these

things in their own way at their workshops are quite ready to judge the question on its merits. But, in addition to the Christian Evidence Society, we have another organization coming to the front in reference to this important question as to what the Church should do to stem the tide of Infidelity, and that is the Guild of St. Matthew under the leadership of the Rev. Stewart Headlam. Their plan is to give lectures on various subjects, and invite the Infidels to be present, and at the close let them say what they like in reply; and even if the answers be most dreadful, we might almost say blasphemous, not to be offended at it, and so by associating with and meeting them in a friendly manner they may eventually lead them to higher and holier things, and so eventually to embrace Christianity. Whether this will answer or not remains to be seen: the question is whether by associating with these men who blaspheme God there may not be a tendency to water down the Faith, and in order to curry favour to minimize the amount of faith required; and we must also bear in mind that the leaders of this Guild are also great advocates of "Socialism," or, as they prefer to call it, "Christian Socialism," and also for relaxing the obligations of the Sabbath; for example the Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, one of the prominent members, stated at the recent Church Congress at Reading that it was as easy to serve God in a boat on the river on the Sunday as in a church. We have no wish to enter at the present time into that most difficult and yet most interesting subject as to how far the obligations of the Sabbath are binding, but we merely quote these statements in order to show that there may be a tendency to water down the Faith, and that familiarity with these men may breed contempt for religion. Yet we are confronted with the fact that Infidelity does exist, whether it be open and avowed, or in the lesser, but not the less dangerous, form of utter indifference; and if anything can be done to counteract its pernicious influence, all Christians ought indeed to rejoice and be glad to help, so long as there is no watering down or pandering to popular feeling. And may not the clergy consider whether it is not necessary that in sermons, lectures, and instructions dogma should be taught, and that something should be stated, and some truth expressed, that the minds of men will grasp and lay hold of. We are afraid that there has been too much of the generalities and technicalities instead of plain, clear dogmatic statement. We have heard it stated that the prevalent idea among many of the atheists of the present day, especially among working-men, is that Christianity is Calvinism, and that there has set in a reaction against this form of Christianity; so that we see what we have already stated, that our Christianity must be so explained by clear dogmatic statement, that there will be no fear of men mistaking forms or systems of Christianity for what Christianity is and what

it really teaches. If men are treated kindly and difficulties explained, we believe a great deal may be done to clear away the mists and to show to them what we believe and what we teach.

LOST WRITINGS REFERRED TO OR QUOTED IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. J. MASKELL, MASTER AND CHAPLAIN OF EMANUEL HOSPITAL, AND ASSISTANT-CURATE OF ST. JAMES-THE-LESS, WESTMINSTER.

A LECTURE TO A SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION.

THE Bible, consisting of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, has come down to us accredited with Divine authority as the revealed Word of God. This is due primarily to the fact that we have been surrounded from infancy, so to speak, with a Scriptural atmosphere. Our earliest lessons have been drawn from the Bible; we have been accustomed to see those whom we could not but highly esteem and love regarding, and teaching us to regard, this Book as the Book of God and the charter of salvation. As we have grown older, and the circle of our knowledge has widened, we have found that although there are many who openly slight the Bible, and treat it as a merely human production, while many more neglect and disobey its precepts, still the wisest and best of mankind, now and at all times, have cherished and honoured it as a God-given rule of life. If ever we have asked ourselves why certain writings have been included in the Bible as we now possess it, and why others have been excluded, we have been content to know that many centuries ago the books of Scripture were collected together, and catalogues made of those which were "generally received" by the people of God as divinely inspired, and that these catalogues substantially agree with the "names and number of the Canonical Books of Scripture concerning whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," given in the 11th Article of the Church of England of which we are responsible members. I am not insensible to the great importance of Church authority. I can quite believe that the Holy Spirit, promised to abide with the Church for ever, directed the Fathers of the Church, in the settlement of the Canon of Scripture, to discern between genuine and spurious writings. I do not believe that, if they "agreed together" to ask for the Divine guidance in this difficult task, they asked in vain. The first Council, or Synod, at which the Books of Scripture were made the subject of special ordinance and description was the Council of Laodiceæ, held, apparently, in the 4th century. There is ample evidence that this Council assembled, and that one of its chief purposes was the definition of the Sacred Books; but as the catalogue of the Scriptures approved at this Synod varies in some accounts and is omitted in others, it cannot be accepted as entirely trustworthy. The Canons of the Third Council of Carthage, held A.D. 397, supply us with the earliest reliable list of books appointed to be publicly read under the title of "divine writings." This list is in substantial agreement with the Books of Scripture included in our Bible. The Fathers, assembled at the Council of Carthage, did not profess to select the

Sacred Books, but only to confirm a selection already in general use in the Church. There is plenty of evidence in early Christian literature that these books were already accepted as divinely inspired. The list of Canonical Books given by St. Jerome and Epiphanius, and by Cyril of Jerusalem, all of whom flourished in the 4th century, agrees in all essential respects with that given in the 6th Article of our own Church.

But whatever importance may be attached to these outward evidences of authority and authenticity, after all, the most powerful and satisfactory witness to the divine origin of Holy Scripture is, in my mind, to be found in the Book itself. The very existence of the Bible is a powerful testimony to the truth of its claims. That cannot be an ordinary book which has had such a wonderful history; which has triumphantly survived so much bitter opposition, merciless ridicule, and keen criticism on the part of its enemies, and so much neglect and indifference on the part of its professed friends. Every attempt to destroy it has failed: in all ages the wisest and best of men have been prone to recognise its superiority above all other writings, and to bow with reverence before its precepts; while to the humblest and least instructed it has ever been the fountain of knowledge, and the source of consolation in the darkest times. We too, no doubt, professed teachers of Christianity, have proved its great value in our own personal experience. We scarcely need to have its authority proved and confirmed to us by any array of external evidences: the Book itself carries its own warrant in the beauty, consistency, and moral efficiency of its precepts. No book inspires nobler sentiments, supplies sweeter consolations, awakens surer hopes, nor sheds a brighter light upon life here and hereafter; no other more directly appeals to the conscience, stimulates to such persevering goodness, and begets more solid contentment with things as they are, connecting all with the will of our all wise and gracious Heavenly Father. This Book, indeed, is surrounded with a halo of transparent truthfulness and sincerity to be observed in no other compositions, and those who constantly breathe its atmosphere cannot fail to find their tastes purified, their minds enlarged, and their hearts made holy.

If it be still asked, How do we know that we possess the Bible? Why do the books bound up in our Bibles, and no others, constitute Holy Writ? We reply, no other books have been found by enlightened Christians worthy of the same honour: those especially who lived nearest to the times when these writings were first promulgated have rejected all others, and the providence of God has either left other writings claiming to be scriptural and inspired, to perish, or has deprived them of the respect of men. Whatever was useful and good in such books has been already embodied in the Bible, and an overruling Providence has evidently taken care that this collection of writings shall be kept separate and superior to all others.

I might add to this wealth of testimony in favour of the *unique* superiority of the Biblical writings the fact that a remarkable unity pervades them, divided as they are by long intervals of date and vast differences in the circumstances of their composition. Recall the long interval between Moses and St. John, and then observe how completely accordant the Bible is in all its revelations concerning God and man, forming as it does one matchless whole, consistent in

all its parts; the different books of which it is composed, at first sight only mechanically, and for the sake of convenience, bound together, yet in reality far more completely united through the internal coherence of thought, purpose, and doctrinal instruction.

There is good reason for believing that the Books of the Old Testament, or such of them as had been already written, were first collected by Ezra after the return from the Babylonish captivity. It seems likely that the compiler, in the task of selection, had but few conflicting claims to determine. The literature of the Hebrews over and above the Scriptural Books, could not have been extensive. The Rabbinical writings are comparatively modern, and fall far short of the dignity and spirituality of Holy Scripture. Yet in the time of Jewish prosperity, during the best days of the monarchy, especially under such kings as David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah, there must have been considerable literary activity in the country, and it may be lawfully asked, What has become of those writings which have not been included in the Old Testament? Holy Scripture helps us to some extent to answer this question. Much of this literature is already included in the Bible; for the books of the Bible are many of them compilations from independent and scattered documents. The historical books especially are compiled from contemporary chronicles, either kept officially or by independent writers like our own Monkish historians. There is nothing contradictory to inspiration in asserting that the writers of the Bible used every human means within their reach to give force and correctness to their productions. They were engaged upon the record of real events; it was a human and not a miraculous history, the divine and superintending providence of God being ever at work to control their pens, protect them from serious error, and guide them into all necessary truth.

Hence it is an open question, and does not touch the question of inspiration, whether Moses himself composed every word of the Pentateuch, or whether he did not rather piece together earlier documents, and collect the traditions of his nation, and that these were again collected and arranged by others after his decease. Although Moses must have written all that part of the Pentateuch which contains the history of his own times, as the leader and lawgiver of his nation, the earliest and latest portions of the Pentateuch we owe to others. The Book of Genesis is for the most part a collection of brief, separate documents, chronologically arranged and welded together into one narrative; and the latest chapters of Deuteronomy, giving an account of Moses' death, must have been by another hand. Nearly all the Books are in this sense compilations. David was only one of the many writers of the Psalms, and Solomon did not compose all the Proverbs. The histories are compiled, as we have seen, from contemporary chronicles; and the prophecies largely consist of reports of sermons and speeches addressed to the people in public in times of national calamity, when the hearts of the prophets were stirred to speak faithful words of counsel and warning. Whatever else of literature the Jews possessed must have been lost in the general wreck caused by the Babylonish captivity. That such literature as was saved was most carefully selected is plain from the testimony of Josephus, the great Jewish historian and apologist, who lived in the first century of the Christian era, "We have not an innumerable multitude of books amongst us, disagreeing from and contradicting one

another; but only twenty-two books which contain the records of all past times, and are justly held to be divine. No one has been so bold as to add anything to these writings, or take anything from them; but it has become natural to all Jews, immediately and from their birth, to esteem those Books to contain divine doctrines, to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them."

The earliest reference to a Book which the sacred writers regarded with respect, but which is now lost, is to be found in Numbers xxi. 14, "Wherefore it is said in the *Book of the Wars of the Lord*, what He did in the Red Sea and in the brooks of Arnon, and at the stream of the brooks that goeth down to the dwelling of Ar, and lieth upon the border of Moab." *The Book of the Wars of the Lord*: Nothing more is known of this ancient writing than the brief passage which is here quoted. It would seem to have been a collection of heroic national songs celebrating the victories of the nation over their enemies. Heroic circumstances are likely to awaken the latent genius of any nation, and the earliest literature of most nations is of a warlike character. From the time of the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage, till the national apostasy before Sinai, the march of the people had been one of glory and of conquest, and a fitting theme for song. Then, indeed, commenced that great tide of song which, beginning with the triumphant ode of Moses over the destruction of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea, recorded in Exodus xv., may be traced throughout all the sacred literature of the Hebrews. Of this wealth of poetical composition the Book of Psalms is a specimen, and perhaps only a fragment or a selection. If we are right in regarding Moses as the author of the Book of Numbers, the poem quoted from the *Book of Wars* must have been the work of a contemporary. Nor is this unlikely. There was nothing in the hard life of the desert to discourage, but everything to stimulate the development of thought and invention. Hence the *Book of the Wars of the Lord* may have well been commenced in the wilderness, and, since it may be presumed that Moses wrote the chief part of the Pentateuch in his old age, there is little doubt that the former book was already known and esteemed, and might fitly be quoted from in the more serious history.

Let us next turn to Joshua x. 13: "The sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies; is not this written in the Book of Jasher?"

Into the question of the miracle here referred to we shall not enter; we are only concerned with the quotation from the *Book of Jasher*. The title of this lost book has been variously explained. It may be interpreted as (1) The Book of the *Upright*, (2) The Book of the *Brave*, or (3) The Book of the *Nation*, since *Jasher*—"just and upright"—may well be taken as a national title. As God's people, it was a righteous and holy nation. Just as the visible Christian Church is called "holy," not because all its members are fully sanctified, but because its Head is holy, and holiness is the ultimate destiny as well as the present aim and aspiration of all its true members; so the Jewish nation as a whole was a nation of the *upright*. Whatever meaning we attach to the word *Jasher*, the title of the Book marks it out as a collection of national, heroic poetry, similar to, or perhaps identical with, the *Book of the Wars* already considered, celebrating the prowess and victorious successes of

the Jewish people. I take it to have been a collection of national songs and ballads recounting the principal events in the history of Israel, and the praises of their most distinguished heroes. The Book is quoted again in 2 Samuel i. 18, introducing the incomparable dirge in which David laments over Saul and Jonathan, "Also he bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow; behold it is written in the Book of Jasher." From this it would seem that the Book was compiled only by degrees, and that any ode or song deemed worthy of preservation was added to it. Hence it grew into bulk and importance with the growth of the nation. It is not unlikely that many of the psalms were taken from it. That it should have been quoted by Joshua, although a contemporary document, is natural, since he might well feel that so remarkable a miracle as that recorded in his account of the slaughter of the five kings of Canaan needed the confirmation of an author coeval with himself. But whatever the character of the Book in question, it has quite perished, probably lost with much other Hebrew literature at the time of the Captivity. There have been, and still are, many Books of Jasher in existence, all of them apocryphal and of comparatively modern date. Six books bearing this title are known to scholars, all different in contents and character, and not one of them having the shadow of a claim to be the Book quoted by Joshua and Samuel. Five of these are Rabbinical works, composed by Jewish writers in modern times, and dealing chiefly with questions of ritual. The sixth and latest is the fanciful creation of an excellent and conscientious English scholar, Dr. Donaldson, who in 1854, published a compilation from the Old Testament of all the passages which he conceived *might have been* taken from the ancient Book of Jasher (or of the *Upright*) an ingenious but utterly untenable work.

In 1 Chronicles xxix. 29, we read of other missing documents: *the Book of Samuel the Seer, the Book of Nathan the prophet, and the Book of Gad the Seer*, containing "the acts of David the king" and in 2 Chronicles ix. 29, we meet with *the Book of Nathan the Prophet, the Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the Visions of Iddo the Seer*, concerning "the acts of Solomon." Similarly we read in 1 Kings xi. 41 of *the Book of the Acts of Solomon*; in 2 Chronicles xii. 15, of *the Book of Shemaiah the Prophet and of Iddo the Seer*, concerning "the acts of Rehoboam;" and in 2 Chronicles xx. 34, of *the Book of Jehu the Son of Hanani*, concerning "the acts of Jehoshaphat." These no doubt were contemporary histories of the reigns in question, and out of them the Books of Kings and Chronicles were compiled, woven into a continuous narrative, probably by Ezra after the captivity. But the Books of Kings and the two Books of Chronicles were hardly compiled under the same auspices. The former bears the impress of a prophetic, and the latter of a priestly influence; independent documents were doubtless collated for the different works. According to 2 Chronicles xxvi. 22, Isaiah wrote a history or chronicle of the "acts of Uzziah;" and since the 2nd Book of Kings says very little about Uzziah, and the prophetic Book of Isaiah only refers to him by name, this also must be regarded as a writing that is lost. On the other hand, the *Vision of Isaiah*, mentioned in 2 Chronicles xxxii. 32, is embodied in his book of prophecy; and the same may be said of *Jeremiah's Lamentations on the Death of Josiah*, in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25. It forms part, no doubt, of the Book of Lamentations which bears Jeremiah's name.

Let us next turn to an earlier reference, to 1 Samuel x. 25, "Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord." *The Book of the Order of the Kingdom*, or of the rights and duties of the king, in relation to Jehovah, the divine Monarch of Israel, and to the nation which was God's peculiar people. This no doubt was a code of laws drawn up by Samuel, the creator, under God, of the monarchy, for the purpose of defining and limiting the royal authority, and preventing the king from becoming a mere Eastern despot, like the rulers of the nations around. This valuable document the prophet "laid up" in the tabernacle, to be preserved, along with the Pentateuch and other sacred writings, as a perpetual reminder of the real vocation of the king and of the mutual duties of monarch and people. It is never again referred to, and was probably lost at the Captivity, if not at the disruption of the monarchy, when the ten tribes separated from Judah during the reign of Rehoboam.

In 1 Kings iv. 32 there is mention of several writings of Solomon not to be found in the Bible. "He spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five and he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." In the Hebrew idiom, "spake" is often equivalent to "wrote;" the words therefore probably refer to certain lost writings of Solomon. The more usual sense of "spake" would be, he *originated* or *composed* them; but the fixed number, 3,000 proverbs, certainly shows that they were written down and collected, probably by himself. These cannot be those in the Book of Proverbs, which only contains 915 verses; and not all of these proverbs, while only one song, the Canticles, or Song of Solomon, is preserved in the Old Testament.

But the other writings of Solomon have perished. It is in accordance with the passage quoted that the Koran praises Solomon as "knowing the languages of men and demons, of birds and ants;" and the Turks still possess a work of seventy volumes, which is called the "Book of Solomon."

Many traditions and fragments of literature, bearing the name of this monarch, are to be met with in Eastern writings; and the East still holds his wisdom in great honour.

With this reference as to the lost writings of Solomon we conclude our brief catalogue of those referred to in the Old Testament. As we have said, their disappearance may be accounted for by the terrible calamities which befell the nation in consequence of the Babylonish captivity. If this be correct, we possess an additional testimony to the value and importance of the writings which remain, and which constitute Old Testament Scripture. The providence of God, which permitted the destruction of so much that was dear to His ancient people, watched over and preserved for our use and for our instruction in righteousness the more precious writings which were to be collected together to form the Old Testament, and to receive that seal of authority from an inspired Apostle with which St. Paul has distinguished them from all other books as the "Holy Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

In the settlement of the canon of the New Testament it would seem to have been more difficult for

the Fathers of the Church to decide conflicting claims than the compilers of the Old Testament, from the multiplication of apocryphal and spurious writings during the first three centuries. There were many lives of Jesus in circulation, besides the four Gospels, and "Acts of the Apostles," over and above those recorded in the book which bears that title. Some of these acquired considerable reputation amongst Christians; they have for the most part perished, and deservedly so. Far below what we now regard as inspired Scripture in intelligence and spirituality, they are less worthy to be placed side by side with the genuine New Testament than the "Apocrypha" of the Old Testament or the uninspired writings of the Apostolical Fathers. They are never referred to by the inspired writers; although it is not unlikely that St. Luke alludes to them in Luke i. 1, amongst "the many" who "have taken in hand to set forth" the story of Christ's life. It is possible also that St. Paul quoted from a lost Gospel a genuine saying of the Lord Jesus, in Acts xx. 35, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Yet, since the Gospels were hardly then written, this is more likely to have been one of the sayings cherished only in the memories of the disciples. Turning now to the Epistles, we find mention of an apparently lost letter of St. Paul to the Corinthians in 1 Cor. v. 9, "I wrote unto you in an Epistle not to company with fornicators." In the Greek, it is *the* Epistle. Our first Epistle to the Corinthians implies throughout that there had been previous communication between St. Paul and the Corinthian Church respecting its disorderly and undisciplined condition; it has therefore been concluded that a previous letter had been sent, to which the Apostle refers in 1 Cor. v., and which is now lost.

I am inclined to think also that Philippians iii. 1 refers to another, or even more than one, Epistle to the Philippians than that which we possess; and in Colossians iv. 16 we read of an "Epistle from Laodicea" of which all trace is lost. Commentators are divided as to whether an Epistle directed (as in Col. iv. 16) to be read in one Church, when received from another, was not a circular letter addressed to several Churches of a kindred character, and that the Epistle to the Ephesians was this letter. But as the Epistle to the Colossians deals with nearly the same topics as that to the Ephesians, and greatly resembles it in language, and is yet a separate document, so the "Epistle from Laodicea" was most likely a genuine independent letter of St. Paul which in the providence of God is now lost. It is probable that St. Paul wrote many other Epistles than those which we possess. Just as it is said in John xxi. 25 of the short but busy life of our blessed Lord, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written;" so it may be said of the work of the enthusiastic and indefatigable Apostle, St. Paul, that he wrote many other letters than those contained in the New Testament during the years of his active ministry. We may safely conclude therefore, with some of the best commentators, that in the passages referred to lost letters are indicated. And lest this should cause us any needless anxiety with respect to the completeness of the Scriptures as we now have them, it should be sufficient to assure ourselves that the writings of St. Paul which remain are more than sufficient for our instruction and for the vindication

and illustration of "the truth as it is in Jesus." Let us reverently believe that, if more were necessary, the Ever-present Holy Spirit would have taken care to secure it for us.

On the subject of the lost letters of St. Paul there are some characteristic and learned remarks in the introduction to Bishop Lightfoot on the Epistles. In the volume devoted to the *Colossians* the same judicious writer reprints a spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans, originally written in Latin but plainly a forgery. It is made up of sentences taken from the other Epistles cleverly pieced together.

We come now to the last of the lost Books of the Bible, if we may so call them—the *Book of Enoch*, quoted in Jude 14. Chronologically the consideration of this Book should have come first, since the life of Enoch belongs to patriarchal times; but I place him last because his book is the last lost volume quoted in our Bible, if indeed it be a "lost volume." Not that it is very clear that St. Jude quotes expressly from a written document. The words are, "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, &c."

This need not have been taken from any book, but may have been only a fragment of Enoch's teachings preserved by oral tradition. We have an instance of this kind in Mich. vi. 5, wherein a saying of Balaam not found in the episodal narrative respecting Balaam in the Pentateuch, is recalled and preserved by a later prophet.

However, a very ancient work is still extant bearing the name of Enoch, and containing nearly the very words of the saying quoted by St. Jude. That it was never admitted into the Hebrew Bible proves nothing, because internal evidence leads to the inference that in its present form it cannot be older than the century before Christ; belonging, therefore, to the period which produced so many Jewish writings that anticipate the spiritual teaching of the New Testament. The *Book of Enoch* may have been simply a Rabbinical work in which the traditional sayings of Enoch were collected, and amongst them the prophecy quoted by St. Jude. Enoch, from the holiness of his life and the remarkable manner of his departure from the world, would naturally be held in much honour amongst the Jews. The Talmud speaks highly of his learning, ascribing to him the invention of writing, numbers, and astronomy. This testimony is repeated in the work of Eusebius, the Church historian, on the "Preparation for the Gospel." Others of the Christian Fathers also highly esteemed Enoch and the book which bears his name. Justin Martyr commended it highly. Tertullian believed it a genuine autographic work, preserved from the Deluge; and the book was known to, although less esteemed by, Augustine. After this we lose sight of the volume in Christian literature till the 17th century, when a few fragments which had been discovered in an old book by the Dutch scholar Scaliger, were printed in 1658. In 1773 the African traveller Bruce brought into Europe from Abyssinia three copies of an Ethiopic version of the *Book of Enoch*; and one of these, presented to the Bodleian Library, was translated by Dr. Lawrence, Archbishop of Cashel, in 1821. Since then it has been still better edited in Germany. That Jude was acquainted with this book cannot be accurately ascertained. It is true that Jude 14 is in almost

literal agreement with Enoch ii.; but, even admitting that it is a quotation, it need not follow that in citing from a questionable volume he intended it to stamp it with apostolical authority as a whole. St. Paul quotes several heathen poets, but certainly without any intention to recommend or approve their works. St. Jude's sanction, therefore, extends no further than to the brief sentence quoted. It may have been sufficient for him that the work was esteemed and studied by his own readers; he would feel free, therefore, to quote a suitable passage as an *argumentum ad hominem*. In like manner he seems to have borrowed the curious illustration against "speaking evil of dignities" from a lost apocryphal book entitled the "Assumption of Moses," Jude 9. It is lawful to use even fictitious narratives in the teaching of moral truth, just as we employ fables in the instruction of children and freely quote Shakespeare, if need be, in sermons.

On looking back upon what I have said on the whole subject, I cannot but feel how often I have been obliged to employ the language of conjecture and probability. So little is known about the authorship and the sources of Scripture, and of the methods adopted by the sacred writers to accomplish their several tasks, that we cannot speak with confidence on such topics. But it concerns us far less to know who the writers of the Bible were, and how they wrote, than to be assured that we possess in the Bible a true and living book for all times, in which God and not man is the leading thought, which will bear every test that the enlightened understanding can apply to it, and which the conscience cannot fail to approve, the more implicitly it is studied, as the only book which supplies us with moral and spiritual truth without any admixture of error, and is therefore the infallible Word of Him "who liveth and abideth forever."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SOCIALISM.

SIR,—In your leading article of the 16th, on Socialism, I find these words:—

"Suppose that Mr. Gladstone were to apply the principle of his land legislation to England, and carry it to its logical conclusion, so as to make an equal division of the land among the rural population."

It is an error as to fact to say that this would be the logical conclusion of recent Irish legislation. The cause for the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881 was this, that the tenant farmers had equitable and customary rights unrecognised by the law, though in any country but Ireland the courts would long ago have given them recognition and protection. The Land Acts were in no degree Socialist, except in that very inaccurate sense in which all interference with the rights of property is often called Socialist. Their operation was much more like that of a land settlement in India than of any project of European Socialists. I cannot imagine any unprejudiced person who has any knowledge of the facts failing to see that legislation was necessary. For the old law, under which the tenant's interest in his farm—often very

valuable—was liable to confiscation at the will of the landlord, I never heard any defence, except that it worked tolerably well in practice, and that the landlords seldom abused their power—just the defence that used to be made for slavery.

It is another question altogether, whether the details of the two Acts, especially that of 1881, have been just to the landlords.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 18th August, 1884.

[In England the equitable and customary rights of tenants are upheld by both the Common Law and Equity Courts; and they either are or ought to be in Ireland, where we seem to have read of the Ulster Custom being sanctioned by a law court. We have been informed on good authority that Mr. Gladstone's Land Act, 1881, had transferred much of the landowners' property to the tenant, and this was our justification for saying that the logical result of such legislation was Socialistic—a view which seems to be entertained by the tenants themselves.—ED.]

CANON LIDDON ON THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Will you allow me to follow up your remarks on Canon Liddon's view of this question?

His words, as you quote them, are "these elements remaining in their natural substances." This is contrary to Trent, which denies that their natural substances remain at all. But

2. "These elements are veiled channels." A veiled channel seems a curious confusion of figures. Perhaps he means a veiling channel. The channel or mode of conveyance is not veiled; it is apparent. It is the thing conveyed that is veiled. We will suppose he means obscure or secret channels. Again,

3. They are "channels of the sacred presence, which is plainly, in whatever sense, identified with them by the very words of Christ." What words? The words, "This is my body,"—not "This is my sacred presence."

4. Perhaps Canon Liddon means by "the body," what Bishop Cosin says, "Christ from heaven reacheth down to us the *divine virtue* of His flesh." We have much the same in Jeremy Taylor, Waterland, Bertram, &c.

5. Christ's body is in heaven, and nowhere else, as the sun is in heaven, and warms us with his rays. Such is the only presence consistent with our article, the Black Rubric, Hooker, &c.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

P.S.—I might also refer to Jackson, Sutton, and Bull, as well as Ridley.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—I have long been of opinion that one difference, if not the only difference, between the two views of the Real Presence in the Eucharist prevalent amongst us is that one set of persons think that that Presence is in the Communion, and another set of persons think that it is in the spirits of the faithful communicants. If so, while we cannot say that the latter are wrong or heretical, we can say that our

Church holds the former opinion, as contained in Article XXIX. Otherwise stated, the Sacrament of our Lord's table is spiritual nourishment to believers and spiritual poison to unbelievers. This is parallel to the operation of other means of grace. The ministry of Christ is to them that are saved the savour of life unto life; and to them that perish, the savour of death unto death. And, analogously, there is a resurrection of the unjust, as there is of the just. The disposition to ascribe the "virtue" of the Sacrament to something in the spirit of the recipient appears to me the same disposition as that which dictates the formula in common use among many Christians, "Christ has saved us if we believe on Him." Whereas Christ has saved all men, *specially* them that believe; and it is by faith that they lay hold of salvation.

The anti-spirituality of Transubstantiation lies in the notion of, not the Real Presence, but the presence of Christ's natural body in the Sacrament. Ridicule of such a doctrine may not be ingood taste; but it is not illogical, nor illegitimate as being such, for the doctrine is contrary to the common sense of mankind. It is also contrary to, or at least inconsistent with, a belief of the Real Presence at all; for that Presence is not real, *i.e.*, spiritual, if it be natural. Canon Liddon's definition, "these elements remaining in their natural substances are yet veiled channels of the sacred presence," is not the same as the transubstantiation doctrine; but it is unsatisfactory. The bread and wine may be called channels, without much of a strained metaphor; but they are not veiled, they are plain to be seen. Again, I do not know what the "natural substances" of the elements are; and I think even whoever uses the term would find it hard to explain what he means. This kind of language is derived from the notions of the old schoolmen, who taught that there is a substance (that which stands under) in matter distinct from its accidents. That is, given a piece of bread, it has certain qualities—size, weight, colour, taste, smell, etc.; take them all away one by one, and there still remains the substance of a piece of bread. Berkeley is thought to have exploded this, and in my opinion, and in the opinion I believe, now, of all sound metaphysicians, unanswerably, except substance means that which is the Cause or Ground of the existence of the accidents in the matter; in which case the substance is not the matter, but extraneous to it. Now this Cause and Ground of the existence of things, which Christians call the Almighty God, and Mr. Herbert Spencer calls the Infinite Energy, is the substance (as I for this once use the term) of the elements in the Eucharist before, as well as after, their consecration. Therefore the presence of the Divine Son of God, who is God, in any miraculous manner is impossible, and redundant to the conception of the Real Presence, if it were possible; a miracle meaning an interruption of natural and ordinary course. But His spiritual presence is no miracle, being transcendental, or beyond the region of natural order altogether; and we have His promise of this His Spiritual presence. B.

25th August, 1884.

SIR,—I feel much obliged for your two able leaders on the above subject. Discussion was what I desired to obtain, and I have obtained it. The leader in your last number leaves nothing to be desired, so far as the first half of it is concerned; which is written with the greatest clearness, and exactly expresses my meaning.

I must, however, again repeat that I am no believer in Transubstantiation myself, nor do I venture to say that the scholastic idea of "substance" as distinct from "accidents" has any foundation in fact. But I distinguish these because the Roman doctrine on the subject, which I am professing to explain, distinguishes them, and goes on the theory or fact of their being distinct. It may be a "baseless fabric" of course. I don't really know what very High Churchmen hold on the subject; but I have no doubt Canon Liddon, for whose intellectual powers you must entertain the highest respect, could give a reason for the belief that is in him concerning it. One point is plain—that whatever our Lord's words—"this is my body"—meant when He used them at the institution of the Sacrament they still mean; and whatever efficacy they possess they possess solely from Him. It is not the formula of a mere man we are dealing with. "If," says Luther, "a baker were to say to me, 'This bread is a body, and this wine is blood,' I should laugh at him incredulously. But when Jesus Christ, the Almighty God, taking in His hand bread and wine, tells me, 'This is my body and my blood,' then we must believe, for it is God who speaks." I use this quotation only so far as to show we must remember that the words of Christ mean more than the words of a mere man. The body of Christ appeared in the midst of the disciples, "the doors being shut;" it suddenly "vanished out of the sight" of two others. It seems to me we should reason very reverently and cautiously about its capabilities; and as regards imputing idolatry to others, I would advise those of your readers who are interested in this subject to read over Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying," section xx. I could quote largely from it in my favour here, but content myself with one or two short extracts. "But for the article itself we all say that Christ is there present some way or other extraordinary, and it will not be amiss to worship Him at that time, when He gives Himself to us in so mysterious a manner and with so great advantage * * * * * For all agree that the divinity and humanity of the Son of God is the ultimate and adequate object of divine adoration, and that it is incommunicable to any creature whatsoever; and, before they venture to pass an act of adoration, they believe the bread to be annihilated or turned into His substance who may lawfully be worshipped, and they who have these thoughts are as much enemies of idolatry as they that understand better how to avoid that inconvenience which is supposed to be the crime which they formally hate and we materially avoid. * * * * * The object of their adoration in the blessed Sacrament is the only true and eternal God hypostatically joined with His holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the Sacramental signs. And if they thought Him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread in this case that themselves profess it to be idolatry to do so, which is a demonstration that their soul hath nothing in it that is idololatrial. If their confidence and fanciful opinion hath engaged them upon so great a mistake as without doubt it hath, yet the will hath nothing in it but what is a great enemy to idolatry, and there is nothing damnable which is independent of the will."

In conclusion, I must beg leave to respectfully protest against the following passages in the second part of your leader, which I regret to say is quite unlike the first. You accuse me of "mistaking obscurity for depth"—of "puzzling myself," and of

"forming a high idea of my own altitude and profundity." In all seriousness I say that for years I have meditated on this sacred subject. I have often prayed to the Lord Jesus to teach me and others to understand it, and will do so while I live, as one waiting for light. I have no desire to write disparagingly of the views of others, whether they be high or low; but I was desirous to show that even the highest views were not generally understood, the Roman doctrine, *e. g.*, being generally caricatured from ignorance of its scholastic phraseology. I am much obliged for the space you have kindly devoted to the subject in your columns, and for your own contributions to its discussion, and hope the result has been to throw more light upon it for some of your readers.

NEBELSTREIF.

P.S.—It may seem trifling to refer to Goethe's "Erkönig" again, but remember the close of the poem—"Erkönig hat mir ein Leids gethan"—an injury which seems to have caused the child's death, for the last line is:—

"In seinen Armen das Kind war todt." Unless the child died of fright, the poet must have intended the fairy king to be something more than an imaginary creature. Perhaps I should apologise for having introduced this literary illustration at all, but it naturally came in with *Nebelstreif*.

SIR,—Will you kindly permit a "plain" layman to say a few words upon the subject of the "Real Presence";

The most solemn service of Christians is the Holy Communion, and the most solemn one of the Jews was the Passover; the one a commemoration, the other a type of the "one Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world."

Sir, it seems to me just as reasonable to believe that the "Real Presence" was in the lamb eaten by the Jews at the Passover as to suppose we now partake of the real body and blood of Christ in the Holy Communion.

ALFRED COLE.

Hoxton, August 25th, 1884.

THE DREAM OF PILATE'S WIFE.

MATTHEW xxvii. 19.

O Pilate! O my husband! let Him go,
The Galilean Prophet!—all the night
I have suffered in my dreams because of Him.

"Thou must approve thyself as Cæsar's friend?"
My dream was first of Cæsar. He was dead;
I saw the funeral rites; and men inscribed
His name among the deities;—'twas false;
Downward his spirit went, to join the shades
Of heroes, kings, and mighty men of old;
And they, arising from their shadowy thrones,
Exclaimed, "Art thou become as one of us,
Thou that didst crush the nations, and exalt
Thy throne above the stars?"

O Pilate, fear
Not Cæsar; "Fear not monarchs of the earth,
Whose rule extends no farther than the grave;"—
So says the Prophet;—"rather fear the Powers,
Celestial or infernal, who avenge
The sins of earth in Tartarus." Oh, I fear,
If thou dost send Him to be crucified,—
I fear for thee and for myself, for Rome,
For Cæsar and the Empire. From His grave
I fear a sacred vengeance.

"Dreams of ghosts?"

'Tis not His ghost I fear; I fear Himself;
I fear His might Who stilled the stormy waves
With but a word,—Who fed a thousand men
From but a single loaf;—Who called His friend
Back from the grave to life at Bethany;—
Who told the people, "Slay me if you will,
But three days after I shall rise again."

"Fables?" Why should not miracles be true?
Were there not wonders wrought in days of old?

"None but the Gods can call the dead to life?"

Oh, if a God could suffer and could grieve,
He were a God. I saw His countenance
Once, for a moment. Fearless were His lips;
His brow was like a hero's; and His eyes
Glowing with love and pity, like a God's.

"The Gods are pitiless?" It may be so;
But if there were among the Heavenly Powers
A God of Pity, and if such a God
Could dwell with men awhile, that God were He.

Thou wilt not heed me? Heed at least my dream;

Oft has a friendly God sent warning thus.
I have told thee how I dreamed that Cæsar died,
And of his welcome in the realms of death;—
Then changed my dream:—under an olive tree
The Prophet knelt; upon the grass were drops
Of blood, that from His brow fell down in sweat;
There was a brooding tempest in the air;
The thunder and the lightning and the storm
Were gathering in the heavens; the thunder's voice
Spake with the Prophet, saying, "Shall we fall
And smite Thine enemies?" And He replied,
"Fall not, I bow in death. The hour is theirs,
The power of darkness ruleth for the day."
And then the Prophet died upon a cross,
Condemned by thee, my husband! but a God,
With face of lightning and with robes of snow,
Came down from Heaven, and raised Him from the
dead.

Then did the tempest burst; the stars fell down
Like leaves that fall in autumn, and the sun
Was turned to darkness, and the moon to blood;
And then the Prophet mounted on a throne
To judge the nations. All before Him stood—
Barbarians, Greeks, and Romans—slaves and kings—
In two vast crowds all mingled. And He spake
To those who thronged upon His right, and said,
"Mercy is for the merciful! and ye
Who comforted the sorrowing, come and share
The blessings of the kingdom of your God!"
Then turning to the crowd upon His left;
"No mercy for the merciless!" He said;
"And ye, who never cared for human woe,
Depart, accursed, into age-long fire!"
And they were borne away to Tartarus;
And thou, my husband, wast the foremost there!

Thou wilt not heed the warning? I depart;
And, if we perish, all the guilt be thine!

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

THE Archbishop's Library at Lambeth Palace will be closed for the recess, for six weeks, from the 1st of September.

ON Wednesday the golden wedding of the Rev. Robert Dixon, D.D., Canon of Worcester, and for eighteen years vicar of St. Matthew's, Rugby, was celebrated with great festivities, nineteen of his child-

ren and grandchildren being present at the breakfast. A garden party was held, at which Mrs. Caldecott, the lady of the manor, on behalf of 276 subscribers, presented the venerable canon with an antique brass casket containing £130, and an illuminated address signed by the donors. A number of other presents were received from the school-teachers, Bible classes, and other parishioners. Dr. Dixon was for upwards of thirty-two years connected with King William College, in the Isle of Man, of which he was for nearly a quarter of a century the honoured president.

ON Friday, the 8th inst., Mrs. Gladstone, who was accompanied by her son, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., laid the ceremonial stone of a new chancel for the parish church of St. Marylebone. A short special service was held on the ground at the south end of the church, upon which the chancel will be built. To give space for the new chancel the present vestry will be removed, and from the rails in what is now the body of the church there will be formed a chancel of nearly fifty feet in length, including the depth of the semi-circular apse, of which the diameter will be about thirty feet, that being the width between the walls of the wings. The cost of the new chancel is estimated at between £11,000 and £12,000.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Asplen, Rev. George William, M.A., Rector of Mepal.
Blenkin, Rev. F. B., Vicar of St. Nicholas', Lincoln; Prebendary of Welton Beckhall in Lincoln Cathedral.
Clarke, Rev. Lewis, Vicar of Westmarsh, Sandwich; Rector of Little Mongeham with Sutton-by-Dover.
Evill, Rev. William Ernest, Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Purley.
Filleul, Rev. P. W. G., Curate of Christ Church, Clifton; Vicar of St. James's, Bath.
Grimley, Rev. Horatio Nelson, M.A., Rector of Norton.
Halse, Rev. W. G., Vicar-Designate of All Hallows, Leeds; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bridlington Quay.
Hutchinson, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of SS. Philip and James', Leckhampton; Rural Dean.
Jacob, Rev. J. Alexander, M.A., Incumbent of St. Thomas's, Paddington; Rector of St. Saviour's, Bath.
Joynt, Rev. R. C., Curate; Vicar of Darnall, near Sheffield.
Lory, Rev. Henry Coulson, Vicar of Cressing, Essex; Vicar of St. Mark's, Liverpool.
O'Reilly, Rev. C. J., Vicar of St. Mark's, Liverpool; Vicar of Cressing, Essex.
Phep, Rev. P. H., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, North Shields; Vicar of Doddington.
Salmon, Rev. Edward Murray, M.A., Vicar of East Grafton, Wilts.
Sherlock, Rev. Henry, B.A., Vicar of Coldham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. James George, B.A., Curate of St. Anne's, Nottingham, and late of Corpus Christi College and Ridley Hall, Cambridge, at Penarth, South Wales, on the 8th inst., aged 26.
Harris, Rev. Thos. at Monmouth, on the 16th inst., aged 73.
Kingston, Rev. Clement Ussil, Vicar of Sutton St. Edmund, Lincolnshire, at St. Theudric, Chepstow, on the 23rd inst., aged 71.
Risley, Rev. Robert Wells, M.A., Rector of Maulsoe, Bucks, at Maulsoe, very suddenly, on the 23rd inst., aged 46.
Wawn, Rev. Arnold Dykes, M.A., Assistant-Curate of Jarro-won-Tyne, eldest son of the late Rev. Edward Bickersteth Wawn, M.A., of Cheltenham, on the 18th inst., aged 28.
Yardley, Rev. John Scott, only child of the Rev. J. Yardley, Vicar of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury, at St. John's-row, in the same town, on the 22nd inst., aged 30.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PRAY THE PRAYERS.

BY THE REV. T. HENRY JONES, M.A., RECTOR OF ASHWELL, RUTLAND, WHEN INCUMBENT OF ST. MATTHEW'S, AND CONFRATER OF WYGGESTON'S HOSPITAL, LEICESTER.

A SERMON PREACHED DURING LENT.

"And it came to pass, that, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, *'Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.'*"—ST. LUKE XI. I.

THERE are some who wander into sad and sorrowful mazes of distrust and difficulty, from the mere misapprehension of some Scripture word: "I may not appropriate the comfort of that promise; I may not cling to that word of encouragement; I may not dare to approach that Holy Table; for that text—that hope—that Feast was only intended for *disciples*."

Now, it is well known that the Greek language is so rich in thought that it is not always easy to render the full meaning of every word in translation. But the word *disciple* offers no such difficulty. A *disciple* (*μαθητής*) of Aristotle, Plato, Epicurus, was any person who attended the schools or lectures of those philosophers. It by no means implied one well skilled in what they taught, but simply a learner, a scholar, one under their teaching.

So, in Holy Writ, the use of this word is not confined to those happy few who are deeply versed in the things of God; but rather describes a class of persons who, desirous to be trained for Heaven, go to school to Christ.

Our text speaks of such a one going to Jesus with a request very solemn in its simple earnestness, "*Lord, teach us to pray.*" It is evident that they who preferred it—(and I say *they*, because that it was the united desire of all, is clear from the Saviour's replying to them in the plural number)—they who preferred the request had already learned something; they were beginning to have some slight knowledge of the heavenly way; they must have mastered the alphabet of Christ's school, if they felt their need of prayer, their own dumbness, and their dependence on the Christ to teach them how to pray.

We feel that they must have been brought to this state by previous teaching; and on searching the Scriptures we find that it was so. The sacred historians relate how the Great Master taught them by precept and by example. By *precept*—

Vol. XVIII.—No. 454.

for in this very chapter He condescends to reason with their faithlessness, and urges them to importunity in prayer, both by argument and illustration. By *example*—for the occasion spoken of in this verse was not the only one on which the disciples had witnessed the fervour of their Lord's supplications.

To them he seemed to "pray without ceasing." Early and late, aloud and in silence, every occurrence appeared to afford Him fresh opportunity for intercourse with the Father in Heaven. Not only every important public occasion, but every little act of daily life, even to the breaking of bread, was hallowed by His prayer. Ofttimes, when crafty enemies tried to "entangle Him in His talk," He seemed with uplifted glance to refer with all the speed of thought to One above; ofttimes when grieved at the "contradiction of sinners against Himself," the burdened sigh told that He was silently pleading for their hardness of heart; and all this gradually leavened the disciples with the lesson that their first and greatest need was to learn to pray, for that every event, even the very ills of life, might be converted into a heavenly discipline by the unceasing exercise of prayer.

And besides all this, they would observe that He secured seasons for retirement even from them, and that sometimes "He continued all night in prayer to God." They would lay to heart, too, how this holy habit of devotion seemed to tranquillize and refresh their Master's spirit; how surrounded as He was, in His then humbled condition, by so many things to agitate and exhaust the energies of His humanity, this communing with Heaven, these

"Prayers in crowded moments given,
Of tumult, toil, and woe,
Did sweeten with a breath from heaven
His weary path below."

And so, at length, the disciples had a wish to pray too. It may be they had tried to do so ere this, but had found it no easy task. It may be that each one had gone for himself in the seclusion of solitude and discovered, by his very attempts to pray, how far he was from God, how sinful were his holiest moments. It may be, I say, that these disciples had felt the misery of their own prayers, felt how unworthy they were to be called prayers at all; that they had felt something of the awfulness of taking upon themselves to speak to God—they who were but dust and ashes—and that all these troubled thoughts issued at length into what was really a prayer—"Lord, teach us to pray!"

They little knew, when they gave expression to this desire, how strange to many of them might be their instruction in Christ's school. It would not be until the shadows lengthened on their path in life. It would not be until there came the toils and troubles, the perils and persecutions, the

buffetings and bereavements of their after-life, that they would fully learn the lesson—how to pray. That they *did* learn it, learn it so fully that they would put nothing before it, we well know. So that their answer to all distractions, even of grave importance, was “*We will give ourselves continually to prayer*, and to the ministry of the Word. And you will observe that, in their anxiety to be taught, they urge upon the Master what they think will be a strong motive; for not only the Jewish doctors, but even John—John the believer on Jesus, had taught those who learnt of him how to pray.

And here, let me ask, my brethren, had not the Lord indirectly, indeed, but still more certainly, instructed John’s disciples in this matter? He, the Friend of man, who now stood in human body on the earth, had He not said in the olden time, what so few earthly friends say, “Call upon me in the day of trouble”? And if we find that He had suffered a heavy trouble to fall upon John’s disciples, was it not in order that they might call upon Him? The divine Teacher, Jesus, had permitted the human teacher, John, to be removed from earth to heaven. He suffered the wicked Herod to seize John and “kill the body,” and that little band was bereft of its leader. But by that trouble those children of sorrow were taught to pray indeed; the verse following that which describes the murder of the Baptist tells us that they took up the headless corpse of their beloved teacher, and “went and told Jesus.”

This was their surest way to comfort, to get into direct communication with the Divine Master, to uncover their sore and sorrowful hearts to the Man of Sorrows, to lay before Him the heavy burden of their woe. This was the way that those early disciples were taught to pray; this is the way that disciples in all ages have been taught; they have had to take up their dead body, any burden that weighs them down, and pour their grief into the all-hearing ear of God.

THIS IS PRAYER.

II. But, next, look at the immediate answer given to these disciples. For now it was that “as one having authority” He taught them to pray—to lift up their sin-soiled faces to the Everlasting, and in Him, and by Him, to call GOD—Father! Now it was that there fell from the lips of God’s own Son that short, simple, and perfect form of prayer with which from that time to the present hour Christians have summed up their own imperfect prayers; now it was that the Heavenly Advocate supplied all disciples with a guide and model for every prayer which is to be acceptable to the Father; that prayer which the infant child, clasping its little hands and bending its tender knees, lisps at the mother’s knee; that prayer in which the old man bowed down by years finds the fittest and best expression of his wants — The Lord’s Prayer. Its sound has gone forth into all lands,

and its words unto the ends of the earth, wherever the light of Christ has shone. By the Indian on the wide, solitary prairie, and the white man in his cottage home; by the Arab in his tent, and the European under the vaulted roof of his cathedral; by the African on his burning sands, and the Laplander amid his everlasting snows; by the mariner on the broad sea, and the Chinaman in his walled city:—in every language and in every clime is uplifted the Lord’s Prayer.

Mark then this fact. The Son of God most High gives us a *Form of Prayer*. He who knew best what man is, and what man’s wants are, counsels us in this matter to “take thought beforehand” what we shall say unto God. He who knew what stifling formalism there may be in forms of prayer, He who must have heard and joined in such forms of prayer as were used by Pharisees in Jewish synagogues, He gives a form of prayer.

Now, this surely will serve to help any who may have been led away by that subtle error which insists on confounding those two utterly different things—a form of prayer and a formal prayer. If Jesus Christ authorises a form of prayer, it cannot be that a form of prayer necessarily constitutes formality. It is clear to any thoughtful mind, that the absence of reality and earnestness in him who prays is what makes any prayer a mere formality.

It is evident that although prayer may be uttered in the unconsidered words which first spring to the lips, instead of from a petition carefully prepared beforehand as to a king; although the words be the hasty effusion of the hour, instead of from some solemn and sublime liturgy, yet if the lips of the heart have not moved, it is as hollow and as heartless a formality as any form of prayer uttered with wandering thoughts. The Holy Ghost did not move—the Lord Christ did not teach—the High God has not accepted it.

My Christian brethren, it is not possible that we could meditate on a more suitable subject in this place, for whatever we may consider and call this house, our God calls it a House of Prayer. It is true, indeed, and in a real sense, that our own houses should be houses of prayer; and those of you who, whether allured by love or driven by some great trouble, have been stirred up to “seek the Lord,” you who have found it true in private, that when you “draw nigh to God,” He “does draw nigh to you,” you who in the secrecy of your own chamber have followed hard after Christ, feeling that if you could but “touch His robe” you should be clean, you who have “shut your door about you,” and would not let your Saviour go until He blessed you,—you would find it a good thing to remember that there are family sins as well as individual sins to confess, family blessings as well as individual blessings to beseech, and so to erect an altar in your own houses, and let the

daily incense of family prayer arise before His throne, who

“For your double life has given
Bread from earth and bread from heaven.”

But I am led to speak to-night of that larger family which gathers together within *this* house, to beseech God with united prayer to bow the heavens and come down to their help. True it is, that this is a house in which you come to hear preaching. I do not underrate that wonderful ordinance of the Gospel dispensation. I believe that plain, faithful, affectionate preaching is more needful than ever in these days; but I hold it useless, except it lead us to pray better, more frequently as for our lives.

I say, then, that this house is especially and above all else a House of Prayer; and as the Great Teacher has authorised a form of prayer, you, who are sons and daughters of the Church of England, do not depart from the primitive model, but worship God in forms of prayer—forms of prayer, my brethren, which next to that precious treasure, your own Bible, you most value, and which you hope to hand down unimpaired to those who come after you; forms, free from irreverent familiarity, and yet penned in such glowing words, that if anything human could prevent coldness creeping over our hearts, they would prevent it. But even Christ's words will not do this. It is only His teaching, and the discipline of His school for prayer, that can quicken the soul “cleaving to the dust.”

You need have no misgiving as to where all the deadness comes from when you rise from your knees within these walls unrefreshed. It comes not from your form of sound words, but from corrupt hearts acted on by that Evil Spirit who, as he

“trembles when he sees,
The weakest of you on your knees,”

has stood at your right hand to resist you, and to distract your thoughts.

And yet I doubt not that these walls *have* witnessed, and *will* witness, many successful by praying our Church's prayers; and indeed it is a solemn thought, that only so far as many have knelt in this spot accepted worshippers will many who lie in their grave beds rise glad on that resurrection morning when the air will be filled with the sound of glad voices, whose prayers are then turned to eternal praise; only so far as this house, my brethren, becomes a house of real prayer will that promise be fulfilled to any of you, of bonds being loosened, blind eyes opened, and crooked wills made straight.

And it is not easy to pray. Like that first class of the twelve, we need teaching, and many a blow do we receive from the Master's rod ere we will learn the lesson.

It is easy, very easy, to offer a service of the lip and voice; but not so easy for the soul to feel all

it utters. It is easy, very easy, to use the noble and thrilling Liturgy of the Church, but not so easy to drive away earthly thought and worldly care; not easy to remember that awful Presence before which we kneel; not easy to make our proud, vain hearts feel poor and guilty; and yet in the might of the mighty God this is what we must endeavour. Like those early disciples, we must carry before the Christ the plague of our own lifelessness, and seek of Him “a hearty desire to pray;” deeply conscious of our own sin and misery, we must cast ourselves before the feet of the Lord of Life, we must creep within the shadow of His crimson Cross, with the disciples' cry bursting from our hearts, “*Lord, teach us to pray.*”

III. And here let me say, that in addition to this general habit of prayer—prayer on your knees in God's house and in your own homes—no long space of time will pass over your heads without affording you occasion for special prayer and for peculiar supplication.

Such an occasion seems the present.

We are gathered together at a peculiarly solemn season of the Christian year, a season set apart for special humiliation and special prayer.

What better means can we use to further the designs of our Church, what better way to bring ourselves down from the lofty heights of self-satisfaction into the low valley of humiliation, than to consider the great deadness of our past prayers; what better resolution can we adopt, what better work can we set about at once, than this—to endeavour to *pray the prayers* with a fervour to which too many of us may have been long strangers.

Here you come to seek a blessing. Here, by prayer, in the midst of earth's manifold disquietudes, have many found that peace “which the world cannot give;” here, by prayer, has many a weary heart been rested, and many a stricken soul been stilled; here, by prayer, has many a youth checked the impetuosity of his passions, and sought for grace to live a faithful soldier of the Cross; and here, even in the evening of life, have come some into their long-deserted church, and wept a penitent's tears, and cried to the Everlasting, “*Lord, teach us to pray!*”

And now, my brethren, if we turn to our own day, and to ourselves, *our deepest want is the same*—it is TO LEARN TO PRAY. It is not a revision of the Prayer Book that we want; it is not a variety that we need; it is not new prayers, but to repent of our past lukewarmness, and to pray the prayers God's love has given us “with the spirit, and with the understanding also.”

We need to pray them with all our hearts, as those who must pray or perish; we need to pray them with the *earnestness* of those who know not the hour when the Master will come and call “for us.” We need to pray them with her *faith* who, while the careless crowd thronged irreverently His pre-

sence, with timid trembling hand touched the border of His robe, and was made whole ; with his *importunity*, who cried so much the more because some tried to hinder—"Thou Son of David, have pity on me!" with his *resignation* who "besought the Lord thrice" to remove some evil from him, and was answered in God's way, not in his own. Let me say plainly, my brethren, that *if there is to be a revival of sound religion*, that is, of unobtrusive, practical piety, *in any place*, it must, *it can only be effected by the inhabitants of that place learning to pray.*

What indeed was it that wrought the wonders of the Pentecost? What was it that bowed the heavens and brought down the Holy Ghost? Was it not the Early Church continuing instant, beseeching God day after day, with a holy unity of prayer, to fulfil His Word? Was not that miraculous outpouring the answer to those prayers? True, what they prayed for was promised.

And what we pray for is promised too. And when you join together in that spirit of supplication which marked the assemblies in that upper room, you may expect not miraculous gifts indeed, but all you need, the might of the mighty God on your side, His Spirit breathing on dead souls that they may live. *And this, after all, is the best way of effecting a revival of healthy religion*, to revert back to the old-established channels, to *throw that earnestness into these recognised services that others throw into more novel schemes.* Only, my brethren, let us earnestly pray the prayers, and then what progress we make will be solid, and we shall not risk that certain reaction towards evil which we have too often witnessed upon the withdrawal of spiritual stimulants.

If sleeping souls are to be awakened, if those who differ are to be led to dwell with us in unity, if we would win back to our pure and Scriptural worship the alienated hearts of many, if the ignorant are to be led to Him who is the Way, the Truth, the Life—you, O sons and daughters of the Church of England, must learn within your own houses, and in this house of prayer—to pray.

What we need is to make our almost inspired forms of prayer living, real, united; *what is above all else necessary is that we should PRAY THE PRAYERS.* Be sure that according to the earnestness of your prayers will be the progress of true piety in your parish; and that what you need is that the incense of true prayer should arise from this congregation, until the whole house is filled with their odour; then would they rise above the clouds, and above the stars; then would He, who ever liveth to make intercession, present them before the mercy seat, purified with His precious blood; then would the windows of heaven be opened, and an abundant answer be vouchsafed, "*Ascendit oratio, descendit gratia.*"

IV. And now, in conclusion, let me say—and the remark will be specially applicable to those who know what it is to have prayed, but who now find themselves so "fast bound" that they cannot open their mouths in supplication for themselves—that there is something peculiarly suitable in the Litany Service of these evenings.

It is a service of intercession;—and praying for others brings down a blessing on your own souls; as you offer up affecting petitions for others' needs, as you join in the exquisite entreaties of the Litany, that heart will find itself warm into life again, which was perhaps suffered to be icebound, because it had so long selfishly regarded only its own needs.

And if in praying for others you are often most truly praying for yourselves, specially in this case, when you pray for those set over you in the Lord, for the more fitted they are for their labours the more you are likely to benefit by their ministrations.

You therefore who expect so much from ministers, and know so little of the dread difficulties of their office, pray for them, that they may be strengthened with God's Spirit, that they may toil in the faith of the Master's Presence, and faint not.

And then, those among whom you live, with whom you come in daily contact, surely they have a claim on your prayers; specially if any are in error of doctrine or of practice. It is, I doubt not, your hearty desire that all who here name the name of Christ might be drawn to the pure and Scriptural worship of your Church. You long that all, in one united body, with one mind and one mouth, might glorify God. Then you may, and you must, arise in the spirit of earnest prayer and beseech God for it. There shall be no spiritual success to you without this.

The God, "who knoweth our necessities before we ask," will seem to be ignorant if we ask not; the God "who knoweth our ignorance in asking," has sanctioned forms of prayer. And you have but to *pray the prayers*, you have but to follow their broad loving Catholic spirit, and offer up your hearty intercession "for all those who profess and call themselves Christians, that they may be led into the way of truth," you have but to pray with this affectionate largeness of heart, to accomplish all you have a right to ask. For oh! let us remember that the only triumph our religion allows us, is a triumph over hearts, and this can only be won by the prayer of meekness and of love. Let us leave disputations to others, and take refuge in prayers. At present the wisest of us have but a side view of God; a few short years, and we shall see Him face to face. And if this church, and our own homes, and above all our own hearts become houses of prayer, then very soon we shall, I am sure, have no dearer name for our Great Friend above than this, the Prayer-hearing God.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1884.

REFORM OF CONVOCATION.

WE are glad to see that there is at last a movement on foot for the reform of this august assembly, both in the Northern and Southern Province. In the Northern Province it has been stated that there has been for some time past "strained" relations and friction between the President and certain members of the Lower House, the result being that the President has announced that in future the two houses shall sit separately. How far this arrangement will work well remains to be seen. Certain it is that the Upper House will be very small, consisting of some nine prelates, some of them men who have made their mark in the Church by their ability; and it is possible that a tenth may be added at no distant date, when the Bishopric of Wakefield shall have become an accomplished fact. The absence of the bishops may tend to a fuller and freer debate among the members of the Lower House, although some regret the change about to be made. The change most to be desired is in the Southern Convocation, for there the official element is remarkably prominent, the number of deans and archdeacons being much in excess of the number of proctors for the parochial clergy: there are twenty-four deans and sixty-one archdeacons; while the proctors for the clergy are only forty-six, or, with the addition of those elected for the new See of Southwell, forty-eight—a representation which is, to say the least, very unequal. If, as it has been stated, that the Church is passing through a great crisis (although there never was a time when more work was being done than at the present), and that before long the Liberation Society will demand the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church, and that, according to their view, justice shall be done, we think

that it is only right that if Convocation is to be the voice of the Church, and that she is to be the deliberative assembly of the Church of England, that she should be thoroughly representative; if while we have a strong official representation of the cathedral and capitular bodies, there ought also to be a thorough representation of the rank and file of the clergy—those who are working in densely crowded parishes of our large towns and cities, and therefore it is that we hail with joy the prospect of some reform, and also that there is likely to be some representation of the unbeneficed clergy; and while we should like to see this done, we do not wish that this should be the means by which certain curates should have the opportunity of venting their grievances, but because, out of the twenty thousand clergy of the Church of England, there are numbers of men who have been working for years, and whose experience ought to tell for something, and who, from their practical knowledge of men, would be able to help bringing about a solution of many difficulties which may arise in the course of debate. In advocating this we do not mean to imply that every new-fledged curate who has just been ordained, or who has just served his title, should be eligible for election; but who has been, say, for five years, in holy orders, and who has held his bishop's license, should be eligible for election. The case of clerical schoolmasters is one which it is difficult to deal with. Some would possibly advocate that they should not be eligible; but this would not in all cases be fair: many of them are men of rare attainments and ripe scholarship, who have taken good degrees in their universities, and whose word and knowledge should carry some weight, so long as they do some pastoral work, however small, and hold the bishop's license; the only fear, however, is that they being in such abundance might possibly overwhelm the voice of the parochial clergy. And then with regard to the admission of the laity, the Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed himself in favour of a House of Laymen, and we know that in many Diocesan Conferences the speeches of certain laymen carry very great weight, and are highly valued; and indeed some of the Conferences would be rather tame were it not for the lay element; and not only in the annual Diocesan Conferences do we have laymen speaking and voting, but also in some dioceses in the smaller Ruri-decanal Conferences the lay representatives are summoned to attend; and therefore if we value their help at Diocesan and Ruri-decanal Conferences, why should they not be admitted to the fuller deliberations of the Houses of Convocation? We are quite aware that some will object. And why, forsooth? Is it because they are jealous and afraid of the voice of the laity? If the Church of England will but trust her lay members, she has nothing to fear; they will never desert her. Of course there must be safeguards, and the line must be drawn somewhere.

Neither do we want the deacondom of some of the sects. Yet by a judicious use of the influence that they will give, there need be no fear for the future. The central council has done much good by its discussions, and they will no doubt materially help in the formation of opinions on certain matters; but then we must remember that this is purely a voluntary matter, and cannot even be said to be thoroughly representative, for two dioceses have distinctly refused to send delegates or have anything whatever to do with it. What is wanted in these days is for the Church to have a thoroughly representative assembly, where men will not be afraid to speak out; and if this can be done by the admission of certain of the unbefitted clergy, and also of the communicant laity, it will tend much to bring about that peace and unity which all true Churchmen should have at heart. We are fully aware that this is a difficult subject, and one upon which there are a great many opinions; but he would be a bold man who would venture to assert that Convocation as it at present exists, with all its *ex-officio* members, is a thoroughly representative assembly of the Church. True, it is the best we have; but we must aim at improving it, and never rest satisfied until the work is done.

SAUL AND SAMUEL: POPE AND EMPEROR.

By EDMUND LAWRENCE, author of "Principles of the Commonwealth."

IN the year B.C. 1095, according to Usher's chronology, which may be taken as approximately correct, a revolution in the form of the Hebrew commonwealth was initiated, which contributed no little to the national prosperity and expansion. The change consisted apparently in nothing but the adoption of monarchy, with the necessary consequence, as society then existed, of the increase of political vigour which a wise centralisation of power often produces. There were other changes, beyond this, involved in the institution of monarchy; changes which developed themselves slowly in the course of three long reigns, spreading over a period of above a century; which were certainly not anticipated by the people, and were, so far as we are informed, unrevealed to the great Seer, in despite of whose opposition the revolution was carried out. Till after the death of Solomon, and the division of the Hebrew kingdom into two, the effect of the institution of the monarchy, and the working of the spirit which prompted that institution, were not completely manifested.

The lamenting words, more than once repeated, of the author of the Book of Judges, over the anarchy and violence which were constantly recurring, if they did not always prevail, during the three hundred years which followed the death of Joshua, are proof that the wish for a strong central authority was powerful among the best of the Israelitish people. That desire received a large measure of fulfilment in the administration of the righteous Samuel, under whom the State, brought to the very nadir of its prosperity in the last year of the life of Eli, underwent a revival which bore some of the marks which indicate the

probability of permanence. Externally, by the defeat of its enemies, the State was stronger, and internally by the pure administration of law and justice. But during the later years of that great prophet and judge, symptoms appeared, not unlike those which foreshadowed the disasters which overtook Israel at the time when he was a young man.

The position of Samuel at the head of the State has a likeness to the position which the bishops of Rome occupied in that dismal period between the Gothic conquests of Italy and the erection of the empire of Charlemagne. As it is not unnatural in a very elementary social state that the power belonging to the priest and the power belonging to the ruler shall be united in one person, so the same becomes occasionally an unavoidable condition, when owing to social dislocation the only strong member of the commonwealth that is left is that which derives its influence from general and sometimes superstitious reverence. Italy, overrun and in great part colonized by the barbarians, lost most of its material civilisation, and nearly all its political order except its municipal system, and that was sorely weakened. The removal of the seat of the Imperial Government to the east left a void, to fill up which there was nothing but the patriarchate of Rome. The popular reverence enabled the bishops, accordingly, to become princes; and there was nothing actually unnatural in this, although the traditions of a more civilised political order insinuated a kind of sense of incongruity, while the existence in theory of an imperial authority, though distant and extranational, preserved the memory of the lost condition. That which was not unnatural to the Italians in the seventh and eighth centuries, although an innovation, was quite as natural to the Israelites, who had no traditions of a social order of the higher kind except the hated remembrances of Egypt. The union of the offices of priest and leader, or ruler, in one man—in strong probability the commonest form which the political society has taken in its first stage beyond the completely elementary one of clanship—was in fact the most natural political condition for Israel at that time; monarchy was a development, a step in advance; and the movement for monarchy was indigenous. The establishment of monarchy in Italy, on the contrary, as at first in an imperfect shape through Charlemagne, came from without. There was not, in that degenerate and divided people, force for the creation of such an institution from within.

There were other differences besides those arising from the character and position of the nations, between the priesthood of Israel and the prince-bishopric of Rome. Celibacy had always been held in high honour in the early Church, as it was so held in the later centuries, even down to the Reformation. Such inroads upon it as were made by some bishops, joined sometimes with attempts to make their office hereditary, were always opposed both by the higher ecclesiastical authority, and by general opinion; and in the case of the primalial See of Rome, there is no record of a married Pope. But celibacy was utterly unknown, or if known, only known to be held in contempt, among the nations of far back antiquity. The sons of the high priest Eli were judges; the sons of Samuel were judges; and it was by no means out of the question, that on the death of Samuel, the authority which belonged to him should descend, at least in part, to his heirs. The priesthood was limited to a certain house; there was nothing in the habits of the Children of Israel opposed to the hereditary system—

much, rather, in its favour; but there was a conviction, while not against the principle itself, very strongly against its expediency in special instances. Imbecile as Eli had been as a ruler, his sons were far worse than he; and the sons of Samuel were not above suspicion, justly or unjustly, their father apparently resenting the suspicion, although he bowed to it.

Popular movements of importance have almost always derived their origin from something that has been long fermenting, and at length breaks manifestly out owing to some incidental cause. In judging of their history, we are often tempted to attribute too much to what may be termed the active cause, or the incident, and too little to the motive cause, or the principle which has been long preparing the movement; the course of the movement, and not the movement itself, being generally influenced by the incident of temporary interest. There is a peculiar danger of falling into this error, a critical one only, it is true, when there is nothing detailed to us in the records which we have, but the very baldest facts, with little comment, and the facts only the most prominent ones. Samuel grew old; his sons were accused of malversation; and the people desired a king; there is little more. Then Samuel sought the Lord, and the narrative now begins to expand and become suggestive.

There are various ways of regarding this portion, as all portions, of the history of the Hebrew Commonwealth as it has been handed down to us in the Sacred Books of that people. One view is that Samuel was an arrogant, ambitious man, as fanatical as such often are, and that he opposed any interference with his power while alive, and with the carrying out of his system after his death, just as any ordinary worldly politician of our own time, or of any time, might naturally and without reproach be expected to do. It is not an absolutely fatal objection to this, that when he sought Divine counsel and guidance, he was answered in a way that he did not expect, for he did not communicate to the people the result of his inquiry from the Divine Oracle; and even after, by his own account, he had received it, he continued his opposition to the proposed political reform, and may have invented the answer to his prayer afterwards for personal exaltation or for political objects. Now I had better say here, that any such explanation, or any explanation which is exclusive of the idea of Scriptural inspiration, I must reject. I believe that these Scriptures were written by holy men of old, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. What that inspiration is, I may have a conception of, but I cannot define it. I know of it almost positively, that it has been given to different men in different degrees, and of different kinds; in different degrees, because these degrees are frequently spoken of in the Scriptures themselves; and of different kinds, because from all that we can understand of the minds of men, inspiration must come to them, when it comes, adapted to their mental and moral constitutions; and the vast, the almost infinite variety that there is in the Bible, is contradictory of such an idea as that the Spirit under which its authors were influenced, spoke to them all after one special, unvarying, or definite method. But no inspiration is conceivable or possible which would leave us at the mercy of authors pretending to truth and *bona fides*, while they give us that which is not *bona fide*, but a distorted and coloured account of events. Therefore I accept, nearly if not quite literally, the account of the transactions detailed in the eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of 1 Samuel. Samuel believed that the popular

demand for a king came from the evil one. His idea of what a perfect State should be was a republic of which he himself should be president, ruling and judging in righteousness under the fear of that God who was the Lord of the whole earth. He prayed unto that God whom he acknowledged as his King, no doubt in full expectation that the answer, if answer was given by revelation, would confirm his own opinion. Now to understand the meaning—the momentousness of that prayer, one thing is to be observed, which in the rapidity of the narrative is very easy to be overlooked. In the course of Samuel's life, a period, according to our chronology, of more than one hundred years, there are five special revelations recorded. This being so, and the delivery of these special revelations being—how they were granted, excepting the first, when he was a child, we do not know—occasions of the most supreme solemnity, we are not warranted in accounting them as part of a system of the Divine administration in any other way than as the history of them is handed down to us. All men may pray, but all men may not expect revelations. No doubt Samuel did expect a revelation, and with reasonable warrant, for he had received such before. But for a man who prays now, and interprets his convictions—possibly his preconceived convictions—into revelations, is presumption, and absurd if not impious presumption. The purpose of Almighty God in founding a commonwealth, and in guiding it through a hard course of discipline during many weary ages, and through many painful passages, was certainly to restore through its means and by its example that glorious order, spiritual and social, of which the human race is capable, which is its true, its natural condition, which it cannot realise for itself, as declined from its first estate, but must have assistance in producing and perfecting, which will attain its consummation in part on this earth, and in whole in the new heavens and the new earth. As it required miracles of grace and might to work out the spiritual redemption of mankind, miracles were likewise required to provide for man's social redemption—interpositions, interferences with the normal course of affairs, not interferences with the true order of the universe, but on the contrary vindications of that true and divine order. But these interpositions, from their nature and intention, were always designed to be few; they were to be like medicine, not like daily food. And as the frame of a young and tender child, whose constitution is infirm from delicacy inherited from its parents, is more obedient to remedies than the frame of a strong man hardened by labour while undermined by excess, and as such a child by all experience requires medicine oftener than the adult, so the miraculous discipline of the world was nearly all administered in its earliest years. We have no miracles now—not that they are impossible, but because, plainly and reasonably, the Divine purposes are carried out by differences of administration under principles which are unvarying. We are not, for all this, to mistake the features of the times of the miraculous administration. Looking back two thousand or three thousand years, the events then are apt to show themselves as foreshortened by distance; we are liable to forget that a generation, a space of thirty or forty years, was as long a period as thirty or forty years are to us now. So that the Divine interposition, the miracle, the revelation, when it did come, never lost by frequent repetition that overwhelming authority which belongs to things that inspire admiration and

awe; the rarity, which we understand at once when we consider the dates of those manifestations, went to increase the reverence towards them. Further, the teaching which we are deficient in our duty to ourselves if we do not at least try to derive from these events is, if nothing more, the fact of the permanence in operation through various times and in various conditions of the political principles according to which society has developed itself, and under which it has progressed and is progressing. "These are our examples, unto whom the ends of the world are come."

There was one thing about the demand for a monarchy which ought not to be unobserved. As the desire had its root in a love of order, although that love may have been combined with a less pure ambition after national greatness and pre-eminence, and with a craving for the externals of a lower and more Gentile civilisation, so the demand for the realisation of the desire came in an orderly form. There was no conspiracy breaking into revolt; there was no choosing of a king, with an imperative call on the President of the Republic to come down from the judgment seat and make way for the people's choice. There was the very opposite; there was an orderly, almost submissive request, and the choice of the king was left, with *carte blanche*, to the President himself. In the very rejection of Samuel, which could not be concealed, and which he sorely felt, there was included the highest possible compliment. Even in the impatience which must have been produced by Samuel's remonstrances and by the delay, no dictation was attempted, and no threats were uttered. All was orderly, deliberate, and constitutional. It was not very much more than a proceeding, during the life of a reigning king, to settle the succession; for there was no intention of displacing Samuel from the high consideration which he enjoyed, and the king whom he was asked to nominate was to supersede him personally as military rather than as judicial head of the State. Not unnaturally, he was displeased: kings often have shown a vehement unwillingness to think of their possible successors. Elizabeth lost her temper as often as her ministers or her Parliament moved her to marriage, or to deciding on the claims of Mary and afterwards of James. And with Samuel the case was stronger, for the movement was for a constitutional change besides.

He prayed, and no doubt reflected long and deeply. Such reflection, entered on by a man who has from youth ruled his inner and outer life as ever in his Great Taskmaster's eye, is itself of the nature of prayer, and in the Divine method has often been used as the preparation for a revelation of the Divine will and judgment. We may not know what thoughts came to the mind of the disappointed prophet, grieving under the sense of what he viewed as an unmerited rejection. It is probable that in his meditations he reviewed the whole history of Israel, from its mighty deliverance at the hand of Moses to its recovery from Philistine oppression in his own middle life, and it is possible that his thoughts took this turn:—"Here is a Commonwealth which has enjoyed at and since its foundation privileges unprecedented and unimaginable—a people which has received a social and political education, minute and superhuman in its excellence; a constitution and a legal code the best possible for it under its conditions, even a model for all nations at all times and under all conditions. They have not only been started in their national life with such unparalleled advantages, but in the course of it they

have been supported as no people ever were; when they have strayed, they have been brought back; when they have stumbled and fallen, they have been raised up. They were led from bondage and established in their nationality by the best and greatest man God ever made; they were led in their conquests by Joshua, the brave, the faithful, and the true; they have had just judges and valiant captains—Gideon, strong with the mysterious strength of faith, Jephtha, who spared not his own flesh and blood in the cause of his God and his country, Samson, physically mighty with the power of twenty giants. They have been led with the pillar of smoke and with the pillar of fire, miraculous witnesses of the favour and care of their Eternal King; kings and nations have fled before the face of the chosen; cities' walls have fallen at the blast of their miraculously endowed trumpets; the luminaries of heaven (if ballad tradition may be trusted) have paused to witness their victories over the Gentiles. But, with all this, the past four hundred years have but furnished a spectacle of chronic anarchy and of recovery merely spasmodic and for a time. It is true that now Israel appears more firmly established as a nation than ever before; our foreign enemies have for years shunned war with us; at home we are prosperous, and justice is duly administered; and yet there is discontent, as there was in the last years of the life of old Eli. What will it be when I, Samuel, come, as I must soon, to give up the ghost? Perhaps He who raised up those great and valiant men in the past centuries will still remember Israel; but if there be nothing in the future, as there has been nothing in the past, but back slidings into sensual idolatry and relapses into political anarchy, it may be that His spirit will not always strive with man. Four hundred years! The world is growing old. The age of miracles is past, or is passing. We are, it is to be hoped, duly thankful for God's providences, and we may look for them again; but we must not look for them as a right, only as graces and favours. He may withdraw them from those who have slighted them, and who have repeatedly rejected Himself. May He forgive my selfishness! for I have no proper complaint to make, if the people, who have rejected their God, should reject me who am only their judge. Or perhaps He who is Infinite Wisdom has resolved that He will use miraculous remedies no longer, and has in store some still more admirable method of working out His inscrutable and eternal purposes. If the world is growing old, the discipline which was good for a child may not be the best for the man. The issues are in His hands.

"If they change the republican for the kingly form of government, they will never change back. Their king will be soon a tyrant, like the petty tyrants of the seven nations, or like that Agag who has made many women childless. If they desire to shake off his yoke, it can be done only by rebellion; there will be conspiracies, perhaps fierce domestic feuds in the palace, desolating succession wars. And if rebellion prospers, how will matters be improved? One tyrant will follow another. Though the monarch will be subject to the perfect laws of Moses, he will obey them no better than the people have done hitherto,—in all likelihood worse; there is a chronic disposition towards the idolatries that surround us, and imitation of the Gentile government may be the precursor or imitation of their religions. If, as the people expect, the nation will, through the energy of a strong

centralised authority, make rapid progress in wealth and conquest, Israel may come to the borders of Egypt, and we may come under a worse slavery than that of Pharaoh—the dominion of the evil spirits, Osiris and Isis. Or if we escape that worst of all, an establishment of idolatry and devil-worship, the kings may not honour the priesthood as is our due. They may claim to be the representatives of Moses, and may tell us that Moses was above Aaron; they may actually assume the priestly office, and offer foul unacceptable sacrifice; they may take on them to ordain and consecrate a new and bastard ministry. All that I can do is to warn the people, but I fear the desire for a king cannot be resisted. Their fathers rejected their God; they have rejected me.”

Am I romancing? I do not think I am. If anything like the above passed through the sore spirit of the prophet, he would be not unprepared for the revelation, startling though in any case it must have been, which answered his momentous prayer. All those saints, the channels through which divine revelations have been delivered, of whom we are in possession of particulars, have been prepared either by discipline or by antecedent circumstances for the reception of the revelations. Moses, Samuel himself consecrated from the cradle, all the later prophets, the world itself, were for centuries being educated for the reception of the crowning revelation of the divine Son of Man. Paul even, though stunned both in body and in spirit with the glory of the light which he saw, and with the sharpness of the words which he heard, was not unprepared for his conversion. He was a Pharisee, and denied not the theoretical resurrection of the dead, but the actual resurrection of the man Jesus, and in the words, “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,” we have a hint, if not an intimation, that he was already beginning to suspect whether he was doing right in persecuting the Church. I do not believe that the answer to the prayer of the father of the prophets was a shock:—

“Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them. . . . Howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them.”

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE COMMUNION AND MARRIAGE LAW.

SIR,—Will you kindly publish the following correspondence between the Bishop of London and myself upon refusing the Holy Communion?

ALFRED COLE.

September 1st, 1884.

[COPY.]

66, BRIDPORT PLACE, HOXTON, N.,

August 25, 1884.

MY LORD,—Being a member of the Church of England, and having married my deceased wife's sister, I respectfully ask your Lordship whether any clergyman in your diocese has the right to refuse me the Holy Communion.

I have been advised to try the question in the law

courts; but, if the want of means did not prevent me doing this, there are, to my mind, very grave objections to decide such a question by common law.

Before a case could come on, I must present myself at some church in order that the clergyman should refuse me the Holy Communion, which, to my mind, could not be done without taking from the service that peaceful calm that should ever pervade the minds of both clergy and laity. For my part, I would prefer waiting until my Saviour shall give me of His feast in His heavenly kingdom, rather than disturb the peace of such a service.

He was driven out of the synagogue by the chief priests and scribes, and dare I expect better treatment than my Saviour?

The Marriage Law Defence Union admit that this is a question concerning which there is great ignorance; and I find that the clergy are of all men, perhaps, the most ignorant with regard to the law of Church and State concerning marriage. It is not my intention to write your Lordship respecting the Scriptural or social part of the question (this I am prepared to do publicly with any clergyman or layman in any part of London), but simply to write your Lordship concerning what is supposed to be the law of the marriage.

Your Lordship will admit that, before an act can be wrong, the particular deed must have been forbidden by either Church or State, or by both.

The marriage with a deceased wife's sister is forbidden by the canons of 1603, but even the *Church Times* admits that “these canons are not binding upon the laity at all.” Mr. E. Clarke stated this very clearly in the House of Commons on May 6th, and the Right Honourable Beresford Hope, Colonel Makins, and all who opposed Mr. Broadhurst's resolution were unable to deny the truth of Mr. Clarke's statement. The marriage, then, has not been forbidden to the laity of the Church of England by the canons of 1603.

The Prayer-book contains the prohibition, but this again is not binding upon the laity; for the Marriage Law Defence Union informs us that Archbishop Parker's Tables of Kindred and Affinity were not in the sealed copy of the Prayer-book when that was confirmed by Act of Parliament, which omission renders them not binding upon the laity. The Bishop of St. Albans, when he wrote to Mr. Hobson that he could not legally be refused the Holy Communion, entirely admitted, by so writing, that the Church has no law forbidding the marriage to the laity.

It would seem, therefore, that the only law by which your clergy could refuse me the Holy Communion is the Act of Parliament, 5th and 6th William IV., cap 54 (1835); and this, upon careful reading, does not give them any such authority. The Act states that all marriages are illegal “within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity,” but by some wonderful blunder omits to state what are “the prohibited degrees.” Your Lordship will thus see that the Act of 1835 (which some are striving hard to retain) in point of law prohibits only what was before prohibited by Act of Parliament; it contains no Tables of Kindred and Affinity, it refers in no way to any, and there is no previous Act of Parliament containing any such “Tables”; therefore the marriage with a deceased wife's sister is neither forbidden by the law of Church or State. Should I be in error, I ask your Lordship kindly to inform me by what law either of Church or State is the marriage forbidden. In con-

clusion I most respectfully ask your Lordship, What right has any clergyman to refuse me the Holy Communion? I am, my Lord, yours respectfully,

ALFRED COLE.

To the Right Reverend
Lord Bishop of London.

[COPY.]

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.,

August 27, 1884.

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of 25th. I am not a lawyer, and it is not my duty to give an opinion, nor would my opinion be of any value on disputed points of law. If, as I have always been advised, cohabitation with a deceased wife's sister is not a legal or valid marriage by the law of the land and of the Church, I presume that a clergyman would be upheld by the law who declined to receive at the Holy Communion persons thus living.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Alfred Cole, Esq.

J. LONDON.

[COPY.]

66, BRIDPORT PLACE, HOXTON, N.

August 27, 1884.

MY LORD,—I thank you for your Lordship's letter of to-day. I was well aware that your Lordship was not a lawyer; neither did I consider the question whether a man could or could not receive the Holy Communion was one to be settled by lawyers, but rather concerned the Church of Christ, for which reason I wrote your lordship, and I am sorry that your Lordship should think otherwise.

I understand from your Lordship's letter, and that of the Bishop of St. Albans to Mr. Hobson, of Epping, that a clergyman would be doing right in God's sight by refusing me the Holy Communion; but that had I married before September, 1835, he would equally be doing right in God's sight in administering the same to me, and that it is *man's* Act of Parliament (5 and 6 William IV., cap. 54) that makes all the distinction.

I am, &c.,

To the Right Reverend
Lord Bishop of London.

ALFRED COLE.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—The great heat which has prevailed through the greater part of August has prevented my replying to "*Erigena's*" letters of the 2nd and 23rd ult. on the above topic. Perhaps it was as well to let any *odium theologicum* slumber while the temperature was so high. "*Erigena's*" letters, however, do not provoke any heat, as they are written with studied moderation, as though he were fully conscious of the difficulties, uncertainties, and contradictions which beset his investigation into the time when our Canonical Gospels were written. I will endeavour to write with the same calmness. This will be all the easier as I find myself in agreement with him on several points.

It is freely granted that Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (A.D. 165), is reported by Eusebius, in the fourth century, to have been acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew and of Mark, while he appears to know nothing of those of Luke and John. He does not claim to have been a hearer or eye-witness

of the Apostles; but Aristion and John the presbyter, of Ephesus, men unknown to us, are his chief authorities. The statements he makes were traditional in his time, and, like all tradition, the exact wording must not be pressed too closely. As a man, too, "very limited in his comprehension" (Eusebius), Papias is not the sort of intelligent critical witness one would wish to produce in court. His greediness for the marvellous discredits him to some extent. Still, as far as he goes, he vouches for the existence of Gospel writings attributed to Matthew and Mark. "*Erigena*," justly influenced by adverse testimony, does not believe that the Gospel in the Hebrew dialect, which Papias attributes to Matthew, is our Canonical Matthew's Gospel misrepresented by that early father; and, naturally, he is not prepared to maintain that first Gospel was the immediate work of the Apostle Matthew. I heartily agree with him. "Orthodox critics," as Dr. Davidson asserts, "who refer that Canonical Greek Gospel, in its present state, to the Apostle have no ground to stand upon."

But now, if it is granted that our Canonical Matthew is not the original work of that Apostle, nor a mere translation of the original *logia* in the Hebrew dialect, *i.e.*, in Aramaic, which all scholars deny, there can be no antecedent objection, if the tradition of John the Presbyter, recorded in Eusebius iii. 39, favours it, to regard the present Canonical Gospel of Mark as differing from the first work attributed to him, though doubtless founded upon it. To object *à priori* is to strain at a gnat, and to swallow a camel. An unapostolic work is not hedged about with greater reverence than an apostolic one. Now the account of John the Presbyter is to the effect that Mark did not write in order—*ἐν τάξει*—the things spoken or done by Christ. His was a record of the substance of Peter's preaching, "but not a history" of our Lord's acts and words. But a careful examination of Mark's Canonical Gospel shows that this work is written "in order," and as well arranged as either of the other two synoptists. It may be as Kenrick conjectures, that Mark rewrote his collection of materials from Peter; but, if so, why should the tradition of his undigested work survive, to the exclusion of his more perfect one? Moreover, Peter's individuality is by no means apparent in Mark's Gospel, as it undoubtedly should be from his bold and ready personal character; indeed, two important passages respecting Peter are unaccountably omitted in Mark's Gospel, *viz.*, the promise of the keys and the payment of the tribute out of the fish's mouth. The fact of Peter walking on the sea is also omitted. If these observations are correct, it is not unreasonable to suppose that a later writer supplanted the unconnected anecdotal notes of Mark, with our present Canonical Gospel founded partly on them and on an original common tradition which is the basis of the Synoptical Gospels. If this work was accomplished in the generation succeeding that of Mark, the fewness of manuscript copies, the harassed condition of Christians, and the ignorance of an uncritical age would eminently favour such a transformation. When Christian Bishops spoke slightly of Christian books, which the majority of believers could probably neither procure from their poverty nor read from their ignorance, the unknown editor of Mark's Gospel would have no difficulties in his way—none greater, at all events, than the unknown editor of our Canonical Matthew. The old traditions concerning both

Matthew and Mark would thus remain, while their works would be supplanted by more perfect Gospels, either called generally, as in Justin Martyr, "The Memoirs of the Apostles," or assigned, in later writers, like Irenæus, to the authors of the original works.

While on the subject of the Synoptists, it is of importance to point out that, putting aside the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew as the acknowledged earliest Evangel (see Dr. Weiss's "Life of Christ"), "the general consent of competent critics has, of late years, pointed towards Mark as the earliest of the Evangelists." (Dr. Abbott.) With features of his own "Mark contains the whole of a tradition from which Matthew and Luke borrowed parts." To say, as some of the early Fathers did, that "Mark abbreviated Matthew and Luke" is now an exploded fallacy. All three borrowed from a common original tradition, agreeing with one another where they adhered to it closely, differing where they introduced their own reminiscences; or some variant tradition and, as a matter of fact, the two longer Gospels, with numerous additions, contain the whole of Mark's Gospel, with the exception of some twenty-four verses. Further, the arrangement of Matthew and Luke is substantially the same with that of Mark. The conviction is forcing itself upon students of Scripture, and I see it endorsed by the reviewer of the *Guardian*, of August 20th, as one in which "the majority of scholars will sooner or later acquiesce, that Mark is in form the earliest of the Synoptists." Dr. Abbott and Mr. Rushbrooke have endeavoured, quite recently, and with considerable success to exhibit in a tabulated form the common original tradition of the Synoptists as chiefly embedded in Mark's Gospel.

Summing up these matters, before "*Erigena*" answer his self-imposed inquiry, "When were our Gospels written?" he has to reckon with the following considerations, the first of which being granted makes the acceptance of the remainder an easier task:—

(a) Matthew's Canonical Greek Gospel is not the original work of that Evangelist.

(b) Mark's Canonical Gospel does not answer to the traditional work attributed to him.

(c) It contains no mark of Peter's personality; rather it omits important particulars concerning him.

(d) The present Gospels of Matthew and Mark are based upon a common tradition, which appears more closely followed by Mark than by the other two synoptists.

(e) This common tradition was a written one, or else the many verbal coincidences of the Synoptists would be inexplicable.

(f) Being unknown, it cannot be assigned to any one of the Apostles, but probably belonged to the sub-apostolic age.

(g) The circumstances of the times favoured the literary manipulation of previous documents and the embodying of verbal tradition in a new text.

Granted, as I gladly do, that, in the second half of the second century our present synoptical Gospels were known and used, as "*Erigena*" claims at large in the case of Justin Martyr, Tatian, and others, I should like to see from his pen cogent reasons why our Canonical Mark, the earliest of our Gospels, could not have been written in the first quarter of the second century, and, what is perhaps more important, the reasonable limits between which the several present Gospels were written.

F. T. P.

SOCIALISM.

SIR,—In your note on my letter in THE PULPIT, of this day, on Socialism and the Irish Land Acts, you seem to believe that the Ulster tenant-right custom has always been recognised by law. This is a mistake: it never had any legal recognition until the Land Act of 1881.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, August 30th, 1884.

THE Bath and Wells Conference will be held at Bath on the 7th of October, at Taunton on the 9th, and at Wells on the 10th.

THE Rev. Reginald Hutton, deacon in the Church of Rome, was received into the English Church on Monday last, by the Rev. Father Black, of Cowley St. John, in the church of All Saints', Clifton.—*Church Times*.

THE Archbishop of York, as trustee for the *Speaker's Commentary*, has apportioned £100 of the profits to the Wiclif Society, which was formed in 1882, to complete the printing, for the first time in history, of Wiclif's writings.

THE Earl of Feversham has presented the valuable rectory of Kirkby Misperton, Yorkshire, which was vacant by the resignation of Canon Body, to the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, sub-warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer. Mr. Hutchings, who was ordained in 1858, is the author of many theological and devotional works.

THE Education Department having intimated that the annual grant to the Norwich Diocesan Training College for Schoolmistresses would be discontinued after this year unless a new college on a more healthy site were erected, the committee have issued a circular with the object of raising funds to carry out this project, which will necessarily prove a very costly enterprise.

THE living of Llangattock, near Crickhowell, being vacant, the Bishop of St. David's appointed a Commission to inquire whether it was necessary that the rector of the parish should be competent to perform divine service and preach in the Welsh language. The Commissioners reported in the affirmative; but they found that there was no need to insist upon a knowledge of Welsh in the incumbent of another parish—Llangenny.

THE Bishop of Lichfield's Theological Prizes for the clergy of his diocese have been awarded as follows:—For Examination in selected Books—First prize, the Rev. C. E. McCreery, curate of St. Mary's, Lichfield; second prize, the Rev. W. Ding, curate of Stoke-on-Tern. For Essay—First prize, the Rev. H. Hughes, B.A., curate of Burton-on-Trent; second prize, the Rev. J. Whitely, B.A., curate of West Bromwich. Hon. Mention—The Rev. J. M. J. Fletcher, M.A., curate of Stoke-on-Trent.

THE *Lincolnshire Chronicle* states that the vicar of Grantham has appointed Lieut.-Colonel Charles J. B. Parker to be parish clerk, in succession to Mr. Godfrey, who retires at the end of the quarter; but that the duties of the office will be performed by Mr. Wilkinson, printer, of Manthorpe Road, Little Gonerby,

the deputy-clerk. Mr. Oldrid Scott has inspected the new steeple, and ordered the removal of the finial, which will receive some alteration, and the spire will be carried somewhat higher, as in the architect's opinion the work, as completed, was of too stunted a character.

WE regret to have to announce that the spire of Patrington Church, near Hull, celebrated for its exquisite proportions as the Queen of Holderness, has been struck by lightning and seriously injured. Many stones were dislodged, some of which fell through the roof of the south transept, and others rested in the bell chamber. The first official act of the newly inducted incumbent, the Rev. H. E. Maddock, has been to sign contracts to secure if possible the safety of the spire. This calamity will hasten the thorough restoration of this singularly beautiful but most terribly neglected church, for which an influential committee has been appointed.

THE Oxford Diocesan Conference will be held on 1st and 2nd of October. Besides some matters of routine, the following notices of motion have been accepted:—Canon Slatter—"That it is desirable that all fees for personal services rendered by the clergy should be voluntary offerings and should cease to be exacted as of right; and that all fees imposed for monuments and permanent occupation of the freehold of the Church should be funded for Church purposes." Mr. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.—"That in the opinion of this conference, the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts forms a reasonable basis for legislation." Sir John Conroy—"That a Parliamentary committee of the conference be appointed." Dr. Phillimore—"That in the opinion of this conference it is desirable that the opportunities for Sunday recreation should be increased, and in particular that museums, picture-galleries, and public gardens should be kept open on Sundays." Archdeacon Palmer—"That, whereas a movement has been set on foot under the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other persons of great weight and authority in the Church to devise means for the promotion of purity amongst our population, and a society has been formed for that purpose under the name of 'The Church of England Purity Society,' this conference do appoint a small committee to consult together on the methods proposed by the said society, and to put any persons (whether lay or clerical) in the diocese who may desire it in possession of information on the subject of these methods." This last resolution is only to be moved if the conference is willing to vote on it without discussion.

REV. DR. MACLEOD, OF GLASGOW, ON VOLUNTEERING.—At the camp of the Scottish National Artillery Association, at Barry, Rev. Dr. Macleod, of Glasgow, conducted divine service on the Sunday. In closing his sermon, he said—The volunteer movement has had a good social influence. One great evil in our land is the separation of classes. The different ranks of life are terribly divided from one another. One class scarcely understands what the other class thinks and feels. The consequences are in many respects disastrous. But in every volunteer regiment men and officers meet together in a manner which enables them to know each other. There is a common interest, a sense of brotherhood, combined with discipline, in a volunteer corps, which gives it a social character not necessarily found in bodies of men held together by the severe restraints of military service.

As a social measure, therefore, this movement must prove of inestimable importance. So strongly do I feel this that I believe it would be of immense advantage to the nation, morally and socially, were all classes of this community to be subjected at a certain age, and for a short time each week, to military drill. The very mixing of high and low, rich and poor, in the ranks would be of untold advantage. It not only gives a certain recreation during those spare hours which some might be tempted to mis-spend, but the habit of punctuality and of obedience to command which it imposes, and the *esprit de corps* and chivalrous courtesy which it inspires, are matters of high moral value.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Burnside, Rev. Henderson, Perpetual Curate of St. Saviour, Forest Gate.
 Caudwell, Rev. W. E. L., Rector of Crux, Easton; Donative of Woodcott in addition.
 Compton, Rev. Spencer J., formerly Vicar of Hanford; Rector of St. Michael's Coslany, Norwich.
 Cornwall, Rev. John Fitzalan, Curate of Danbury; Rector of Barton-in-the-Clay, Beds.
 Corrie, Rev. Edgar Sirriit, M.A., Vicar of St. James', Greenstead Green.
 Courtney, Rev. William J., Sole Charge of Dent, near Sedburgh.
 Eaton, Rev. J. R. T., M.A., Rector of Alvechurch; Rural Dean of Northfield.
 Hill, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Head Master of Warwick Grammar-School, Chaplain to the Earl of Warwick; Chaplain of Lord Leicester's Hospital, Warwick.
 Hutchings, Rev. W. H., M.A., Sub-Warden of Clewer; Rector of Kirkby Misperton, Yorkshire.
 Joynt, Rev. R. C., B.A., Curate; Vicar of Darnall, Sheffield.
 Lethbridge, Rev. A., M.A., Rector of Shepton Beauchamp.
 Northey, Rev. Alfred Edward, M.A., Vicar of Rickmansworth.
 Ryan, Rev. A. T., Curate of Stanhope; Vicar of Corton, Suffolk.
 Shaw, Rev. H. J., M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Brightside, Sheffield.
 Wood, Rev. W. Hardy, M.A., Rector of Benwick, Isle of Ely; Rural Dean of March.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Buckmaster, Rev. John, Vicar of All Saints, Wandsworth, suddenly, at Sussex Lodge, Wandsworth, on the 28th ult., aged 64.
 Dawson, Rev. Frederick Akers, M.A., formerly Chaplain to the E.I.C., and Rector of Buscot, Berks, at Easterton Vicarage, on the 28th ult., aged 87.
 Egremont, Rev. Edward, M.A., for nearly fifty-nine years Vicar of the parish, at Wroxeter Vicarage, Shrewsbury, on the 31st ult., aged 83.
 Flint, Rev. W. C. Raffles, M.A., after a short illness, at Sunningdale Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 65.
 Ness, Rev. Edward, M.A., for many years Rector of Elkstone, Gloucestershire, at Seale Lodge, Surrey, on the 26th ult., aged 80.
 Odell, Rev. Maurice Collis, M.A., late Chaplain to the Forces, and incumbent of Pusilawa, Ceylon, in London on the 19th ult.
 Shipman, Rev. Thomas Trafford, M.A., Rector of Lydiard Tregoz, Swindon, and Hon. Canon of Carlisle, on the 27th ult., aged 53.
 Wood, Rev. William Paul, M.A., St. John's College, Oxon, thirty-two years Rector of the parish, at Saddington Rectory, Leicestershire, on the 26th ult., aged 61.



The Church of England Pulpit.

WHO IS ON THE LORD'S SIDE?

A SERMON TO VOLUNTEERS.

BY THE REV. C. T. BUCHANAN, LATE CURATE
OF NESTON, CHESTER.

PREACHED IN NESTON CHURCH TO THE 1ST
CHESHIRE RIFLE VOLUNTEERS ON SUNDAY,
JULY 30, 1882.

"Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves unto him."—
EXODUS xxxii. 26.

WHO is on the Lord's side? What a solemn question is this for any one to ask, and more especially, for me to ask you all this morning, when I see before me, in this Church, a body of men who have enrolled themselves for the defence of their country, whose services I hope will never be required. Were I to ask them, Who is on their country's side, and ready to fight for it? I am sure there is not a man in their ranks, but would step out and say, I am ready to go wherever duty calls me, and to lay down my life in defence of my country were I called upon to do so. But the question of the text is one of far more importance; it relates, not to this poor passing world, but has reference to a far brighter period, when wars shall cease, when universal peace shall prevail, when the kingdom of this world, shall be no longer ruled over by the prince of this world, but by the King of kings, and Lord of lords; then it will be seen who are on the Lord's side and who are not.

There are only two classes now, as there will be then: those that are on the Lord's side, and those that are on the side of His enemies. Of the latter class St. Paul said: "Many walk" (Ah! how many, alas! do), "of whom I have told you often, and now tell you, even weeping, that they are the enemies of the Cross of Christ." Not one in this church this morning, can be neutral in this great cause, and must each one answer, for himself and herself, in God's sight, whether you are on His side, or on the side of His enemies; and remember the response you give this serious and all-important question, may decide even now your final destiny. Let it be seen (let your light so shine before men) on whose side you are, whose colours you wear, under whose banner you have really enlisted, whose cause you are fighting in earnest. I trust

many here, who are soldiers of an earthly sovereign, are also soldiers of the Cross, not in name only, but in reality. If you are, you will overcome in the great battle you are daily and hourly called to engage in, and at last, be more than conquerors, through Him who loved you, and gave Himself for you; and when the last great struggle is past, when death has been overcome, the grave triumphed over, you will find to your endless comfort you have been on the winning side, and will be crowned with the victor's crown, join in the celestial strains of heaven's sweet music, as you praise for ever the Lamb. Let us for a short time this morning glance back and see what was the cause, which made Moses, the servant of God, utter this question in the text, "Who is on the Lord's side?" The children of Israel had but lately seen the wonderful works of the Lord; they had beheld the mighty signs and wonders which He had wrought in the land of Egypt, whereby the Egyptians were compelled to let them go; they had seen the waves of the sea standing as a wall of defence for them while they passed over on dry land, and reached the shore in safety, not one of them perishing; but their enemies pursuing after them, were destroyed, chariots, horses, and men, overwhelmed in one confused mass by the mighty power of the sea—the Egyptians whom they beheld that day with terror, they beheld them no more for ever. How strange it is, that to-day, our forces are, as it were, engaged in a war with Egypt, and we trust will come off as victorious as then. But since those days what changes have taken place in the art of war, the chariot has given place to the many-tonned gun, and all the ingenuity of man has been brought into play to invent the most destructive weapon, so as to bring the most disastrous wars to a speedy termination. What with eighty-one ton guns, Armstrong and Gatling guns, very little chance there is now of escape, pouring forth (as I saw at Sir Wm. Armstrong's gun factory at Newcastle last year, the Gatling guns doing) so many thousand shots a minute. Verily this is the age of speedy destruction, when any war has been entered into. The children of Israel journeyed for three days when they had crossed the Red Sea, and then murmured for water, filling the air with their complaints against Moses. He was directed by God to take a tree and cast it into the waters, and cause the bitter waters to become sweet. Again they murmured more violently than ever, that they had been led from the flesh-pots and plenty of provisions, which they had in Egypt, into a barren wilderness. Once more the goodness of God meets their wants. He graciously promised to rain down from Heaven bread, He sent them feathered fowl, and He gave them angels' food. One would have thought, thus protected, thus blessed, any other want they stood in need of they would have prayed for, and not have murmured; but their future history shows how false this idea

was. Travelling onwards, they wanted water. Moses tried (but all in vain) to still their rage, and to wait God's time with patience; but in place of this they only grew more desperate, and threatened to stone him. In this serious dilemma Moses had recourse to God, and God commanded him to smite the rock in Horeb with his rod, and the water would not only gush out to allay their thirst, but that the stream should flow in dry places. Moses obeyed, and God made His promise good. After this an enemy arose—the Amalekites. Their king came to oppose Israel. God was pleased to give them a signal victory. Now they arrived at Sinai, where God designed to call the people to communion and covenant with Himself. Amidst the loud sound of trumpets, the pealing of thunder, and the glittering of lightning, the voice of God was heard proclaiming the Ten Commandments, which were to be the foundation of all other laws, and the ground-work of the Covenant. The people promised all obedience, and begged they might no more hear that dreadful voice, lest they should die. Soon after this Moses was called up to the mountain to receive the law, written on two tables of stone. In the meantime the people, who had seen him go up and enter the cloud, while the mountain-top burnt with fire, after waiting for about a month, give him up as lost; and in this uncertain state they assembled together in a riotous manner before Aaron, and told him that as they had no expectation of Moses' return, it would be wise of him to make them gods to go before them. Such was his weakness and cowardice, that he did not seem for a moment to hesitate, or rebuke this sinful desire of the people, but at once fell in with their wishes, and directed them to bring him a sufficient quantity of ornaments to make a golden calf, which they did. He received them, fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it, a molten calf, and they said, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." When Aaron saw it he built an altar before it, and proclaimed a feast unto the Lord on the morrow. We are told they rose up early, and offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings, and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play, thus forgetting all the wonders, the mercies, and the blessings which God had showed them. They turned their glory into the similitude of a calf, and remembered not the obedience they had promised a few days before, but made a golden calf, and fell down to a graven image. How often do we find people thinking, when they are doing wrong, no eye sees them; but they forget not only are their own eyes looking at them, but the eye of the all-seeing God is also looking at them, which is of far more consequence, and sees what they are doing, although the work they are engaged at may be, and too often is, done in the dark. Thus it was with these idolators. God was looking at all that was passing in the camp of Israel, and saw

they were making themselves more than ever unworthy of His care. God informed Moses, who spent forty days in fasting and prayer, of what had happened, and threatened that He would consume them; so much so that he feared some heavy punishment, if not total destruction, would fall on the guilty. Moses besought the Lord, and came down from the mountain with his servant Joshua, and the two tables of stone in his hand. Scarcely had he reached the foot of the mountain, when he was astonished at the strange shouting which he heard. It was not long before he saw the cause of it all—the calf which his brother Aaron had set up, and all the people dancing around it. So struck with grief and horror was he, that he threw the two tables from his hands, and rebuked Aaron in the strongest manner possible for consenting to so vile a deed, which now laid Israel open, naked and defenceless, to all enemies. For this act the people had forfeited the Divine protection, which could alone preserve them, and bring them in safety to the promised land. Aaron failed not (as is too often the case now) to blame the people for doing wrong, when directed to do so by some one who should have known better; but Moses did not listen to such a lame excuse as this, which in reality was no palliation for the offence, but hastened at once to destroy the idol, and to take steps to punish the guilty, who, when they saw him, fled and left their false god. Moses caused the calf to be taken down, burnt, and ground to powder, and cast into the water, which he made the people drink of, and while he was doing this, he called out, in the words of the text, "Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me." In answer to this he was joined by the sons of Levi, whom he commanded to gird on their swords, and go and slay all whom they found still at the idolatrous feast, without regard to age or sex, quality, kindred, friend, or foe; and we are told there were 3,000 guilty Israelites whom the sons of Levi found still struggling about in the midst of this sinful mirth. The day had commenced with a violation of God's law, and with pleasure; it closed with a signal triumph of the justice of the living God, and with sorrow in many a household. Can any of you here to-day call to remembrance a day commenced with breaking God's law, and ending, as surely it must, with some sorrow for the crime. Happy shall such be if that sorrow be not death, as it was the end of those idolators who broke God's law. How solemn and startling must the words of Moses have sounded in their ears—"Who is on the Lord's side?" Conscience-stricken, knowing they were not on His side, they fled from him who uttered these words, to hide their heads from impending vengeance, from that punishment which they felt was due, and so richly deserved. One tribe alone, that of Levi, answered the call; and from this it may be supposed that they had kept themselves from the idol, and they were made the

instruments of judgment. How painful it must have been to the tender and compassionate Moses to be obliged to be the executioner of God's vengeance, and to command the tribe of Levi to slay every man his brother, his companion, and his neighbour. The Lord Jesus Christ has introduced another dispensation by the New Covenant, and the summary punishment of the Law has been exchanged for long-suffering forbearance. Now, the righteous and the wicked, the wheat and the tares, grow together until the great harvest day. The Gospel net is cast forth, and contains fish good and bad of every sort. Now, we see the idolaters of this world, the breakers of God's laws, the bowers-down to the god of this world, the true worshippers of God, the obedient and the lovers of the Almighty, all mingled together till the end of the world. The division and reward take place not now, but surely do loom in the future. The horizon, to the one (if their eyes were open), would seem charged with the clouds of Divine wrath, while, to the other, it is bright with the rays of future glory, the blessed hope of a joyful resurrection. But if the proceedings were to be adopted now which were in the days of old, who would escape if the cry was now made—"Who is on the Lord's side?" How many would flock to the "upraised banner of the Cross?" How many would obey the command, Let him come to Me? Alas! alas! it would be found the number would be indeed few. Yet there is an appointed time. He that cometh from Bozrah, travelling in the greatness of His strength, who is red in His apparel, will come and will put in motion the winepress of His wrath. His glittering sword is bathed in Heaven; He hath bent His bow and made it ready for the overthrow and destruction of His enemies. All shall see and know the righteous judgments of the Most High, then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not. Now, let me ask this question: "Who among you are on the Lord's side?" It cannot be possible but that many of you are. Oh, that we could say all of you were! Let each one, however, take warning by what you have heard this morning, and be decided at once on whose side you are. None can be, as I said at the outset, neutral in this great struggle. You must be either on the Lord's side, or on the side of His enemies. If on the Lord's side, beyond a doubt you are on the winning side. God is the strength of your life, He is greater than man, and we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. The Leader and Commander of the people is our Friend, our faithful Ally, and if He be for us, who can be against us. His sword and shield turn on every side for the defence of His children. For His word by the aid of His Holy Spirit assures the believer that Jesus is with him unto the end of the world; and we are winners in the fight, because

this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. But while those who are on the Lord's side are on the winning one, those that are not (and, alas! how many those are) are on the losing side. St. Paul says, "Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize?" Now if any of you are living in any known sin, yet trusting (as too many do) that in the long run the mercy of God will be extended to you, such are decidedly on the wrong side (on the losing side); and know you, that unless you speedily repent, you are already lost, no operation of the hand of man, or action of his mind, apart from Christ, can bring salvation to any soul. Christ must save, and Christ alone. Oh, how rapidly time is hastening on, already the summer has gone (the little we have had of it), and the autumn may be said to have almost commenced, and the winter is rapidly coming on. And, it may be, some now listening to me this morning are still undecided upon whose side they are, and while in this most unsatisfactory state, are staking the things of time against the solemn realities of eternity. Eternity! Oh, dwell upon that word, study it, hang on its infinite depths, fathom it, if you can; gaze upward and scale its heights, if you can; stretch away over its illimitable breadth, measure it, if you can; give wings to your imagination, and speed onwards, find it if you can. Think of as many centuries as there are drops in yonder ocean; when these have passed all away, begin a new series of as many centuries as there are sands on the sea shore, multiply all these centuries by the number of the stars in the sky, and remember that eternity has but commenced. The music of Heaven has opened, the remorseless agonies of the pit still in their first pangs of woe, the death of the lost soul, ever dying. Let but the lost soul be left to itself, and if there is no material hell, no lake of fire, the simple withdrawal of God's love for ever from a wicked soul, and the imprisonment of that soul for ever in the dungeon of despair, without a ray of hope, will be everlasting death, too awful to think of without a shudder. At the end of myriads of centuries those pangs will have just begun. On every wall of this vast prison-house the lost soul will read in letters of fire—"Ye knew your duty, and ye did it not." Heaven will be as endless in its joy as hell in its remorseless agonies; so I read what is revealed in God's word, although there are many now who deny the eternity of punishment. This eternity is just at the door of every one of us. You and I may be launched into it ere to-day's sun goes down, or ere the curtain closes in this night. Oh then see that we are ready, with our loins girt and our lamps ready, to obey the summons whenever it comes. The Master is come, and calleth for thee. What is time to us but the brief hour for preparing to meet the destinies of that eternal world? What have we to do but to save our souls, and to save

others also? Oh, let us all live here on earth in the light of eternity. The noble Lord Russell, when he mounted the scaffold to die, said to his friend who stood beside him—"Take my watch, I have no more to do with time, my thoughts are now about eternity." I would say to you all, take your Bible, learn from it how to live and how to die. You will soon have done with time, oh, think of eternity! Take home with you all the question of the text, Who is on the Lord's side? and be determined, with God's help, no matter what others do, you will be enlisted under His banner, you will fight valiantly for His cause and for the faith once delivered to the saints; and then, when time shall be no more, and you have fallen asleep in Jesus, you will on the morning of the Resurrection awake up after the Redeemer's likeness, you will receive the victor's crown, and be for ever of the number of that white-robed throng, "who have washed their robes and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb." "They are before the Throne of God, serve Him day and night in His Temple. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light upon them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the Throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

MR. G. A. SPOTTISWOODE, chairman of the London Diocesan Layhelpers' Association, has written to us explaining a difficulty which that society has met with in making preparations for the November Mission at the East-end of London. Out of the thousands of its members who work steadily within their respective parishes, between three and four hundred men have volunteered to give themselves to the work of the Mission. But there is great room for the work of women also, especially as from the want of an organisation for them similar to that already at work for men, and of a centre round which they might gather, but few have as yet offered their services. "To supply this emergency (says Mr. Spottiswoode) a small committee has been formed by some members of our association, consisting of the Rev. E. L. Shelford, vicar of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton, Mr. C. M. Westfield, myself, and a few others. We have asked and feel assured of the approval of the Bishop of Bedford, who we trust will act as our chairman. Men and women have each their separate and peculiar sphere in the Mission; each can do a work which the other cannot. We earnestly beg all women of whatever rank in life who have the will, and some time, however little, for this work, to associate themselves with us, and to give in their names and addresses at once to C. M. Westfield, Esq., 44, King William Street, London Bridge, E.C. Those who kindly offer themselves will shortly receive a communication from Mr. Westfield, informing them of the parish to which they have been appointed, and where their services will be welcomed. The date fixed for the Mission (Eastern division) is from November 16. to November 23 inclusive, and as many more days as shall be determined in the several parishes."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months' 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1884.

THE LONDON MISSION.

THE arrangements for the ensuing London Mission are now being made, and in the course of a couple of months the Eastern and Northern districts of the Metropolis will be plunged into the religious fervour, and a certain amount of earnestness and excitement which such a mission must necessarily create. England has seen many and various phases of religious life and enthusiasm arising from the use of those external means other than the ordinary chastened, sober services of the Church of England. A few years ago two evangelists from across the Atlantic made their appearance, and visited several of the principal cities and towns, and at last visited and spent some time in the Metropolis. The one was gifted with the power of bringing home certain truths in a manner different to the ordinary ways of pulpit utterance, the other a sweet singer, with voice of marvellous compass, and whose songs and solos took the religious world by storm, and have ever since been largely used by various denominations of Christians. Since then we have had the grosser form of the Salvation Army, with all its parade, knee-drill, cross-firing, and the like; to which may be added an entirely novel proceeding, viz., a whole night with Jesus, an all-night holiness convention, the utility of which many will question. Another organisation based upon Church lines, is styled the Church Army; to say nothing of the various isolated missions in different places, conducted by Mr. Aitken and those connected with him; and when we remember how coldly churchmen looked upon these so-called missions (the word is said to be borrowed from Rome) when first brought into prominence some years ago, we may indeed thank God for all His goodness, and that churchmen have at last realised the fact that there are other

ways and means which must be used, if the Church is to regain her hold on those who are living in sin and ignorance—sheep straying from the fold. It is for this purpose, we take it, that this Mission has been arranged, and if we may judge from the work of the Bishop of Bedford at the East End, and the establishment of Mission Houses, with colonies, so to speak, of university men living among the denizens of these slums, and other means which are being used, we may well believe that success will attend the efforts which are being made in this direction. But these special efforts which are made to bring back wanderers to the fold are of no use whatever unless there is a work going on already in the parish. A most eloquent and gifted missionary may come, crowds may gather together to hear him, yet when the time is past, and the strange voice has gone, what is the result? The souls who have been impressed by the burning words spoken by the missionary, accompanied by, we trust, the out-pouring of the Spirit, are anxious to do something to show by their actions that they are in earnest; but time is taken up in organising this and that, and so while the plans are being matured, they get either indifferent, or the impression has partly vanished owing to the vicar or rector not being ready to “strike while the iron is hot,” or they have wandered far afield, and joined themselves to some other communion where they have been gladly welcomed, and found the work ready to their hand which they wish to do. On the other hand where there is plenty of work going on, classes for old and young, communicants’ union or guild, district visiting, and other works of a similar kind, then, when the mission comes, and souls become anxious to do some work for God, the organisation is all ready; one can help in a bible class, another can take a district, others help in cottage lectures, or become members of a guild or communicants’ union, and so the mission in this way is a real and valuable help, the appeals of a wise, discreet missionary has great power for good, and the hands of a vicar and his co-workers are really strengthened by the *impetus* thus given, but where there is nothing going on, the mission is only a stirring of the stagnant waters, which after a short time sink down into the same calm state as they were in before, possibly helping to fill the adjoining meeting-house. This has been the case in more instances than one. Another feature in the mission preaching of the day, and especially in that of the American evangelists, though by no means confined to them, is that the teaching of the doctrine of repentance is to a great extent lost sight of, and seems to have hardly any place in the plan of salvation. But there is no duty which is so important, and upon which so much stress is laid by our Church as this. For instance in the confession of the Communion Office: “We do earnestly repent and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings.” It

is not enough to excite the feelings and stir the emotions, there must be sorrow for past sins. A confession of sin unto God must precede a true and genuine repentance, then when the soul sees how far it has gone astray it arises like the prodigal and retraces its steps along the bitter path, till it prostrates itself before the Saviour whose loving correction has been despised and set at naught. This we take it is “conversion.” We are told distinctly by Mr. Moody* that we cannot have godly sorrow until we repent, but St. Paul tells us that “godly sorrow worketh repentance.” We have no wish to enter into the arena of controversy; all that we say is this, that if a mission is to have any lasting effect it must be by proclaiming the whole Gospel, not the repetition of mere empty platitudes, nor yet of namby-pamby sensationalism, but the putting forth of plain definite statements founded on the teaching of the Church of England as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, and where this is done good and lasting results may be expected. In these services, especially in the instructions which are given at the after-meetings, it is well that definite points of dogma should be insisted upon; and in the “services for men only,” so much to be desired, there is opened a wide door for pressing home those truths which belong more especially to men; their special sins, sicknesses, and temptations can be spoken of at such a time, and the “bow drawn at a venture” may strike the heart with the arrow of conviction. And indeed anything that can be done to bring these questions home to men—questions which press so strongly upon us, and which demand the earnest careful thought of churchmen of all schools of thought—must be gladly welcomed; and at such a time a mission preacher has a golden opportunity of speaking a word in season, an opportunity which if rightly used may be productive of incalculable good to the present as well as to succeeding generations.

SAUL AND SAMUEL: POPE AND EMPEROR.

By EDMUND LAWRENCE, Author of “Principles of the Commonwealth.”

(Continued from page 114.)

WHEN a child comes to be a youth, and his tutor or his schoolmaster finds him outgrowing his authority, and longing for more freedom than the rules of the study or of the school-room will allow, and the master represents this to the young man’s parents, a wise father gives more liberty, and if he must launch out his son upon the world, he gives him, with that liberty, the best counsel and warning how to use it. Like to this it was then. But the wise father is, in this, yielding not to the will of his son; he is yielding to and obeying nature and natural

* “D. L. Moody and his Work,”

order. And Samuel was not "carrying out the popular will," as is said now sometimes to be the function of a statesman, because it was the popular will, but because it was God's will, and it was right that in this the people should have their desire. He chose Saul, guided to the choice by Divine inspiration. He chose a man whose personal qualities were such as to command allegiance from a people in a simple and not much more than primitive state, whose chronic condition was that of border war, and whose aspirations were after aggrandisement, as well as after a more stable civilised order than their nation had yet ever enjoyed. Saul's moral qualities were as yet to be discovered; it was plain to men's eyes that he was physically qualified for leader by height and strength, and he was brave like every borderer. In the course of forty years then to come, it was found that he was superstitious and fanatical without being religious, even to that degree that, like the elder Brutus, he was willing to sacrifice his own son's life for an idea; but that he was, while physically courageous, as submissive as one of the lower animals to whomsoever assumed authority over him; and at last, that he was jealous, vindictive, and treacherous with the half-savage treachery that lies in wait for its enemy, all these dispositions being coated over with a tendency to insanity, which, as we regard it variously, either aggravates our dislike or mitigates our censure. Many sermons have been composed, and moral essays written, taking the first king of Israel, his exaltation and his faults, and his not inglorious though melancholy end, for a text. It is not in these matters, which have their own interest of course, that the importance of the history of the early Hebrew monarchy consists; all ages contain examples of men spoiled by sudden power. The interest of this part of the Hebrew history lies in its being the first definite record of the perpetually arising opposition between the spiritual and secular authorities, between Church and State, between Pope and Emperor.

Moses led a nation from Egypt, which had only one settled institution by which its permanence could be secured—the rite of circumcision, a rite which marked and distinguished each and all of its members. The nation had a common ancestor, and its distinctive mark was of the nature of a religious sacrament. But, though a nation, it was not a state, till Moses made it one, with a constitution and laws; and being a state, it had as yet no Church, its religion being but vague and unanchored, till its Church, with priesthood and ceremonial, was appointed by Divine authority through Divine inspiration. (So was the Second or Christian Church appointed.) That is, the order of the social evolution was, first the family; second, the political society; and, third, the spiritual society. This was the order in time, and it is the order in authority too. The State is not to supersede the family; nor is the Church to supersede the State. Neither is the State to override or to regulate the parental jurisdiction; and the Church is not to override or to regulate the temporal government. On the other part, although Moses, the secular ruler, the legislator, is superior to Aaron the high priest, and although the high priest was appointed by the civil ruler, that was done by superior authority, and once for all; for a perpetual succession of the priesthood was ordained. To re-initiate a priestly order is not within the lawful power of the State or of its head, whether the head be a republican head or a king or emperor. This analogy holds good in the Christian commonwealth; but

with this exception—the State is the superior in jurisdiction to the Church. Moreover, the spiritual life of the Church enters in a wonderful manner into the domestic life, far more intimately and more subtly than the political life of the State can, or ought, if it could. Thus the three social organisms are mutually interdependent, and through their action and reaction upon one another a condition, perfect as is possible to human imperfection, is susceptible of being evolved. Of the three organisms, the Church, being, if not the most holy, then the most unworldly, is also, if corrupted, susceptible of the most malignant corruption of them all; and the most certain methods of inducing corruption in it, are by its imitation of the forms of the State, and by its offering to usurp the functions of the State. Hereditary succession is of the very essence of the family, it is a principle which the State may adopt or not, while in accordance with its genius; it is absolutely incompatible with Church order, seeing that the succession of the ministers of the Church is without appeal ordered otherwise. Usurpation of the functions of the political Society by the minister of the Spiritual Society is an incongruity, evident to all men who live in a good and stable order, besides being utterly discountenanced by the older and better Scripture precedents; a state of things which is justifiable only by its being, under certain wretched circumstances, the only choice between itself and anarchy.

Recent examples had shown to the Israelitish people that the hereditary principle was not fit for practical adoption. Hophni and Phinehas, and now Joel and Abiah had not illustrated their honourable parentage. Accordingly the demand by the people was not for an hereditary king, but for a king only; Samuel, however, evidently contemplated, as being the most orderly constitution, the establishment of a royal race. He accepted the situation, as is now sometimes said of politicians when they concede; but he did not do so with his whole heart. (I have said that I believe the Bible to be given by inspiration, and I believe that Samuel was an inspired man, and that he was possessed of rare prophetic gifts. But when the historian does not expressly say that this prophet spoke by divine commission, and only records his sayings, I do not admit that we are to take those sayings as carrying more authority than that belonging to all that a good and wise man utters, he being liable to err like the rest of us. This, I believe, is treating the sacred book with more honour than if I accepted every word of Samuel and every other prophet as of inspired authority; and the rest of the analogies of Scripture are according to this. David was inspired by the Holy Ghost when he sang God's praises; but not when he tempted his lieutenant's wife. Paul says plainly that there is a difference between the value of some of his sayings and of others. Balaam had gifts of the spirit of God, but he was inspired of the devil when he made merchandise of them. There was one only unto whom God gave the Spirit without measure.) At the time when Samuel finally surrendered the seals of office, he made a boastful oration, not unlike that which Scipio made when taxed with malversation. No one had taxed Samuel; and his speech was plainly an intimation that he intended to continue his active interest in State affairs; accompanied as it was with a call, apparently equally boastful with his speech, for a sign from heaven; the only instance in Scripture history, if we except the triumphs of Moses over

the magicians, which are not similar, in which a miracle was enacted (I shrink from using the suggestively irreverent word *performed*) for no purpose but to manifest mere power. A year after this there occurred an event, which I think proves that Samuel nourished in his mind a grudge against the King. He appointed a meeting with him to offer a solemn sacrifice before advancing to battle with the Philistines. Saul, in the absence of the priest and prophet, offered the sacrifice himself. Now I think he was acting within his powers in so doing. Good order, human and divine, requires that each officer in Church and in State, shall adhere to his own proper department. It is the priest's function to burn incense, and to offer a burnt offering; but if there is no priest, the worship is not to be suspended, though its form may require to be varied. Luther held that if a ship's crew were cast on a desert island, and had no minister with them, their duty would be to commemorate our Lord's death by themselves. Anything else is exalting the letter which killeth over the Spirit which giveth life. If it is said that the announcement which was then prophetically made to Saul, that the crown should pass from his house, is against this view; I answer, that the historian does not say, actually abstains from saying, that Samuel had forbidden the sacrifice to be made before his arrival. That which by law could be performed by a priest only, was the offering of incense; but sacrifice was an essential part of the polity of the Israelitish worship. Samuel desired, if I am right, to maintain after the establishment of the monarchy an amount of priestly, I am inclined to call it, papal power, which is inconsistent with kingly power and right independence. He had prophetic gifts; and with that spiritual discernment which may exist without those gifts, but which they cannot exist unaccompanied with, he had probably seen that Saul was not the man to build up a great and potent kingdom; in which the events of the latter part of Saul's reign conspicuously justified him. In all probability Saul had shown dispositions which Samuel interpreted rightly; but I am of opinion that the latter chose to place the final rejection of the first king on formal and not on essential grounds. I think so the more from the circumstances of the occasion on which, with words of passion, he told him that God had "rent" the kingdom from him. In the meantime, the events evidence the weakness which the intrusion of priestly upon royal prerogative has in all times produced. Saul was plainly cowed by what happened; according to Usher, six years passed before any great advantage was gained in the weary chronic war with Philistia. At length came the memorable expedition against Amalek. Saul, brave in the field, weak in the closet, refrained from carrying out to the letter the orders to destroy utterly; thus turning the administration of the Divine purposes into an occasion for plunder; (the only explanation I can suggest for an otherwise inscrutable command). Samuel reproached him in terms which I can understand only on the conjecture that here there is a hiatus in the history. In Saul's behaviour there was nothing which can be properly characterised as rebellious; that is an epithet which is applicable not to every act of disobedience or neglect of orders, but to special acts only of revolt; and stubbornness there was none, for Saul received the rebuke most meekly and apologetically. I am convinced that here, as I believe in the first case, many years before, Samuel's displeasure was for more than the mere faults which were the occasion of his

censure. The breach was now complete. It is said that Samuel mourned for Saul; it is not said whether he mourned as for a lost friend, or with the disappointment of a disappointed, ambitious man.

It is true that part of the foregoing is only conjectural, and that the conjecture that the relations between the prophet and the king were of the same kind as the relations between Thomas of Canterbury and Henry the Second is too uncertain to build an historical theory upon. This cannot be said of the conditions of the civil war which broke out in the youth of David, a war for which the reigning king was exclusively to blame. Saul probably had an instinct, if nothing more, that David would be his successor; he may have had, and in great probability had, that jealousy against him which kings often bear towards their heirs, aggravated by the jealousy which the triumphal reception of the giant-slayer first awoke in him; and he may have been permanently soured by the knowledge, possessed by himself alone, of his rejection. All this does not detract from the guilt of his repeated treacheries, and his perhaps simulated reconciliations. Much less does it detract from the guilt of the atrocities of that war, especially the worst atrocity, the massacre of Abimelech and the priests. David was the head or rallying point of the ecclesiastical party, and for this the king's vengeance fell on them. This is so evident, and marks so plainly the existence of the feud between Church and State, that it requires no elucidation.

But though this is so, and though I cannot doubt that Samuel, when he anointed the son of Jesse, and later, when he witnessed and rejoiced in his valour, fully expected that that wonderful youth would in good time, by his support of priestly authority, almost make up for the depression which it suffered under the monarchical institution, the issues were not exactly such as may have been forecasted. David was not a vindictive man. One by one, after Gilboa, and during seven years of civil war, the sons and adherents of Saul were defeated and slain; there was no anti-ecclesiastical party left. When, in the thirteenth century of the Christian era, the papalists, or Guelfs, of Florence, had, after thirty-years of confusion, utterly annihilated the Ghibelline or Imperial faction, and banished their leaders from the city for ever, they began to split into factions of their own. There were ultra, or black Guelfs, who looked on their fellow-citizens who loved liberty more than Popery, who fought for Popery because it protected liberty, and not for liberty because it was the accidental ally of Popery, as being equally heretical with the Imperialists themselves; and a second set of seditions and ostracisms supervened, with even greater permanent loss to the State of crowds of good and faithful, even of illustrious, subjects. In like manner David found the sons of Zeruiah too hard for him. When Henry, king of France and Navarre, routed his enemies with a great defeat, and the wide Norman plain was covered with fugitives who could see no way for escape, and it appeared at the moment that all France was at his mastery, his soldiers called out to give no quarter, but their merciful and politic commander forbade them. In like manner David would have no wanton slaughter, and he punished almost with his own hands his too zealous subordinates. There was in him nothing of the toleration for disorder, if not the ingrained spirit of anarchy, which has distinguished Guelfic partizans in nearly all periods; for there have been Guelfs and Ghibel-

lines wherever religion has had any freedom, as there have been Tories and Whigs, or their parallels, wherever there has been political freedom. It is quite true that King David was politically the head and rallying point of the ecclesiastical party in Israel, all through his reign, as well as at its beginning; and this is apparent in the support his throne received from the high priests, Zadok and Abiathar, at the time of Absalom's rebellion.

There is something utterly opposed to the mere sacerdotalist spirit in the resentment which he exhibited at the punishment which was meted out on Uzziah for a profanation of the Ark, the guilt of which it is difficult for us to understand. The records of his life, inward and outward, which he left behind him, witness the same. There is not a word in all his poems tending to the exaltation of the priestly character or function. The word priest occurs only five times in all the Psalms; and the spirit with which it is used is the very spirit of our daily service, wherein bishops and curates are prayed for in their ministerial capacity, while the person of our monarch is spoken of with an almost religious reverence. It is, in connexion with these considerations, no small thing that the greatest poet of the Hebrew people, he, too, whose hymns form part of the worship of the whole Christian world, was a layman.

I am unable to discover, in our accounts of the commotions at the close of David's reign, and in the establishment of Solomon, anything that marks the continuance of the ever-recurring Church and State quarrel. But that Solomon was of the priests' party I think is apparent. For, if I am not mistaken, it was through their being more or less unfaithful to their own religion and their own country, that, from Aaron downwards, foreign modes of worship, sometimes Syrian, more lately Egyptian, and last of all from the countries of the Euphrates, were imported. Solomon's marriages with foreign wives were part of the same movement. At the end of his reign and life Israel was divided, and a new State with a new priesthood and almost a new religion rent off from the Israelitish stock; an unmistakable revolt against priestly supremacy, destined, however, to lead to the absorption of the new kingdom in the general Gentile Babel. During the following few centuries there were in Judah many times when national revival occurred, and, in all those cases, the prime agents were not priests, but kings.

The contest, in a different form, recurs in Christian States. Some people think it is over; some, that whatever relics of it there may still be, will disappear with the formal separation of the Church from the national polity by way of establishment. The contest is as alive at this moment in some parts of Europe as it was all over Europe in the age of Becket and Alexander the Third, noticeably in Belgium, and it is re-opening in Italy. It is not closed in Prussia. It is not closed in England. Nor will it be closed in England if the Church of England is "liberated from State control." Because it is not the State, as such, which is the proper and rightful antagonist of the spirit of clerical ambition; it is the laity, the true body of the Church, who, if they love true religious liberty and true religious and Church order, will be always jealous with a wise jealousy against those whose instincts as an order of ministry tend to make them forget that they are ministers at all. It is only rarely that in Christian communities encroachments are made on the proper

prerogatives of the spiritual order; the converse, unhappily, is not rare. And the suppression of such encroachments, on one side and on the other, is most effectual, by experience, according to the reasons of the case, and by the inferences to be drawn from the Book of Inspiration, where the body politic and the body ecclesiastical have their independence and their interdependence wisely and duly defined by law.

NOTE.

I do not agree with the conjecture that Samuel was not of the priesthood. The historical probability is that he was; and his "ministering before the Lord, being a child," shows that he was an acolyte in youth. The fact that he was the first of the order of prophets, between which order and the priesthood a kind of opposition (or oppositeness as concerning functions) existed, is not a ground for supposing him not to have been of the latter as well as of the former. The prophets did not supersede, they supplemented the priesthood. This is according to the course of ordinary political development. The success of the religious reformation of the sixteenth century, and its conservativeness, were very greatly owing to Luther having been a monk. Samuel's religious reformation, and the political reform which followed it—the establishment of monarchy,—were highly conservative and anti-revolutionary. I need scarcely point out the parallel.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SOCIALISM AND IRISH LAND ACTS.

SIR,—I think there is another and most serious objection to Mr. Gladstone's last Land Act for Ireland, besides that which you have alleged, viz., its transferring property from the tenants to the landlords. This objection is that it overthrows the very idea of property by setting up a tribunal for rearranging the terms of tenancy of property. And this tribunal is absolutely despotic.

I am not learned in profane history, but I cannot recollect any similar instance in the history of any free country. Here in Ireland is a court which has the power of transferring property from one set of persons to another without being obliged to give any reason for their action, and without being liable to have their action reviewed.

Suppose a court set up in England to deal on similar principles between employers of labour, and those whom they employ. How would Messrs. Bright, Chamberlain and Co. like to have their scale of wages revised by a court of analogous power, from the decisions of which there should be no appeal?

It will probably be replied that no such court need be feared, because its action would at once make manufacture impossible.

I believe this is quite true. But will not the action of the Land Court in Ireland soon make landlordism, *i.e.*, the holding of property in land by those who do not themselves farm the land, impossible? This is what the Irish agitators desire, and make no secret of their desiring. Will it be a good thing for the State? If it will, might it not be as good a thing for the State if the possession of manufactories by persons, not

themselves engaged as workmen in them, were made impossible, if the property in manufactories were transferred from the rich manufacturers who "toil not, neither do they spin," to the poor drudges who do toil and spin at present, in their service?

I am rather surprised that this seems to have escaped the notice of those benevolent English capitalists to whom Ireland is under so many obligations.

R.

REFORM OF CONVOCATION.

SIR,—The Archbishop of Canterbury adjured the Lords to "trust the working classes." Conservative laymen do not distrust the working classes, but they do distrust the promises of the Premier as to Redistribution, fearing, like so many other promises, they may be merely verbal:

"'Tis a sharper, who takes thy ready cash
And pays thee nought but wishes, hopes and promises,
The currency of idiots!"

If we look into the question of the ecclesiastical representation of the laity, we shall find a general distrust on the part of the bishops in any liberal "Franchise Bill" for Convocation, and the idea of "an ecclesiastical redistribution of seats" in Convocation is never really grappled with. The Archbishop of Canterbury wishes we had a "Lay House," but His Grace has propounded no definite ideas yet as to its voting constituency; he has yet to consider who are eligible, and he has not given his views as to what share of government he would accord to it. Are we to "walk by faith" in Archbishops as well as in Premiers. The idea of *servitude* is more apparent in proposals for admitting the laity than the idea of really participating in the government of the Church. The mere semblance of power is the utmost length to which the Archbishop has yet attained in his proposals for a "Lay House."

In the early Church, we know well, that clergy and laity sat together in council. If this fact is alluded to now before bishops or clergy, it is immediately scouted as something quite out of date. It is better to face boldly the great objections made to the laity having a fair and working position in Church government.

1. Neither bishops nor clergy, as a body, wish to see a representative Convocation in which clergy and laity sit together.

2. Neither bishops nor clergy, as a body, are willing to allow actual legislative power to the laity.

If my view is wrong, let some friend of the Archbishop of Canterbury state this. Let him state from authority that the Archbishop is liberally inclined to promote a "Franchise Bill" and a "Redistribution Bill" as an integral part of a scheme for developing the Church in England and Wales. The benefits of such union of clergy and laity would soon be apparent. The Clergy would know what is "public opinion" on Church questions. The mass of the clergy do not know this, if we may judge by expressed lay view of us; we depend on some one Church organ to guide us; and as to the laity, as a rule they do not read "Church papers," preferring to judge more impartially.

The interest taken in our Convocations by the great majority of the clergy and laity is of the smallest possible kind, nor can we hope for better things, if we have "Lay Houses" where bishops, clergy, laity, have no opportunity in public debate of

correcting or enlarging the ideas one of the other. If the Church is disestablished, something more approaching "the voice of the Church" will be demanded, and a Representative House of Assembly will assuredly be forced on the Church by laymen. Surely it is wisdom to admit the just rights of the laity of the Church of England to a living voice in ecclesiastical affairs, and quite as important for Conservative archbishops to "trust the laity" ecclesiastically, as to uphold their particular views in the House of Lords of "trusting the working classes," when no one wished to distrust them. If the objection is raised that, with such a Government as the present, legislative power will not be permitted, the reply is, the proceedings of Convocation constantly show the would-be exercise of such power, and the proposal to have a "Lay House" by the Archbishop of Canterbury certainly must aim at giving some weight to Convocation. No conceivable extra weight can arise except more is done than at present thus to promote the Church's weal ecclesiastically. I do not think that any Government (however composite, as at present) would refuse to the two Convocations of the Church some self-government, provided the ecclesiastical Franchise and Redistribution schemes were *liberally* settled. If the archbishops would come forward and show how far they "trusted the laity," the Government of the day might be expected to give serious attention to the subject. At any rate the archbishops and bishops would become our leaders in putting forth schemes which "come under the sphere of practical politics."

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, Sept. 6th.

THE TYRANNY OF CUSTOM.

SIR,—Recently the Earl of Essex wrote to a daily contemporary on "the subject of funeral reform. Therein he mentions "the crying abuse and folly" of expensive and ostentatious funerals. "On all occasions when I have had any influence," his lordship remarks, "I have acted upon the principles of the strictest economy and simplicity; and most assuredly, whenever my own time may come these principles will be strictly carried out under written directions; and such written directions there should always be, otherwise friends and relatives are generally loth to take upon themselves to do away with all the paraphernalia, the mockery of woe." It is to this reprehensible timidity that mortuary abuses can be directly traced. Those whose first and bounden duty it is to move in the matter pusillanimously shirk their obligations to the dead. And what is the result? Why, that everything is confided to the professional undertaker, whose interest it is to make as much vulgar show as possible, for by this means he enhances his profits, to which he has a special "eye."

It is to me surprising how, in a matter of such manifest importance as the burial of the dead, people, otherwise intelligent enough, suffer their predilections and prejudices to overpower their good sense and reason. The truth is, they are so strongly influenced by

"That monster custom, who all sense doth eat
Of habit's devil,"

that they regard with strong misgivings any radical deviation from the ordinary course. People do not reflect, owing to the gloomy horrors with which it is

habitual to overspread the grave. Nor can this be wondered at, considering that, with the honourable exception of the directors of the London Necropolis at Woking, the arrangements for obsequies are stupidly entrusted to illiterate and non-æsthetic tradesmen, whose repulsive insignia fitly correspond with their monstrous mode of burial. "Funeral furnishers," as they now affectedly call themselves, have done their best to inspire a horror of death in the public mind. Most of their superfluous paraphernalia are gloomily suggestive. Their regulation coffin is simply odious, serving but to preserve the dead for indefinite periods in rank putridity, which earth-to-earth sepulture would entirely obviate. Their stupid pageants, mock heraldry, and grotesque proceedings so savour of coarse vulgarity, and the absence of proper solemnity as to deserve universal execration. A vast deal of crass ignorance exists among the general public. With the inferior classes of the community, over-costly funerals are supposed to show the degree of estimation or affection which they bear towards their departed kinsfolk. I regret to say that others who ought to know better are influenced by the like senseless motives. Imogen only expresses the general feeling when she observes to Guiderius :—

"Custom calls me to't,
What custom wills in all things should we do't."

Now, as regards the subject of simplified funeral rites, much of late has been spoken and written about it. Tens of thousands of persons mentally approve of it; know that the public, high and low, would be materially benefited by it. But fell custom gets the better of them when occasion demands their interference; exacting friends counsel them to follow the beaten track, so as to escape the charge of singularity. These combined forces prove too much for weak wills, and hence the perseverance in blind error, so fraught with mischief in several ways. It would be a gratifying sign if the nobility generally would follow the example of Lord Essex. Then we may expect that the middle and lower *stratum* of society would be induced to favour funeral reform, as regards simplicity of details, when the natural burial of the dead, without indestructible boxes, would soon become popular. The public health would gain immensely by the change, and a great mortuary abuse would be removed.

CLERICUS.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE GOSPEL AND THE AGE." Sermons on special Occasions. By the Bishop of Peterborough. London: William Isbister, Limited. Pp. 325.

OF any volume of Sermons by the Bishop of Peterborough it is needless to use the ordinary eulogistic adjectives. It will be assumed that they are deserving in every respect of serious and careful thought; perhaps most of all by readers who may not in every respect agree with them.

And the one respect in which we cannot agree with them is the prophetic pessimism—if the expression is lawful—of their tone. It runs through the whole book, but is especially noticeable in two sermons,—the second, "The Final overthrow of Evil," and the tenth, "The Gathering of the Vultures." In the former, after a very condensed summary of St.

Matthew xxiv. and parallels, of 2 Thessalonians ii., and of the vision of "Babylon the Great" in the Apocalypse, the Bishop proceeds: "Of the exact meaning of all the details of these mystical pictures we know very little; but, surely this much at least is clear, that they all foreshadow not a great growth of good and decay of evil, but rather a great growth of evil and decay of good, to be ended at last by a sudden and final overthrow of evil at the coming of the Lord." (p. 45.)

So again in the sermon on the Vultures—perhaps the most strikingly eloquent in the book—the Bishop says:—"Thus does our Lord teach us to answer the *where* and the *when* concerning His coming, and the judgments that are to accompany it. He teaches us in fact this,—that all human history is but the record of ripening here and there, and of judgment here and there; that it is not so much one long straight line unfolding itself, as a series of parallel circles, ever widening and widening still, each perfecting itself in sin and judgment, until at last the widest circle of human transgression shall have spread itself all out, and the great ocean of humanity blacken all over beneath the cloud that broods over it heavy with the wrath of God." (p. 229.)

Now let us be bold enough to differ, and to examine as briefly as may be this pessimistic view both of prophecy and history. And first our Lord's prophecy in St. Matt. xxiv., and parallels, in which he says our Lord "makes His coming in judgment to Jerusalem the type of His last final coming to judge the world." Now surely this is getting more out of the words than the words will give. What the disciples asked was, "Tell us when shall these things be [the 'not leaving one stone upon another'], and what shall be the sign of Thy coming [*τῆς σῆς παρουσίας*] and of the end of the world" [*καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*]. Now this question cannot possibly have had even the slightest possible reference to our Lord's second coming, for the disciples had no such idea in their minds nor could they have had. They wanted to know when the exclusive Jewish period or dispensation would be over, and when that kingdom of which the prophets had spoken, and over which they recognised that Jesus was King, would begin. They were not asking when the end of the world in its modern, but quite unscriptural, sense (unless 2 Peter iii. 10 *et seq.*, be considered so), would take place, for they were not looking for any such end; nor could they very well have expected that the Messianic Kingdom should at last sink in clouds and darkness, when the prophets had distinctly spoken of its "increase" and its "endlessness." Surely our Lord's answer must be read with the question, and even if it be admitted that St. Matthew has incorporated therewith other prophecies of our Saviour's, as some think, or that the destruction of Jerusalem is a type of "the final overthrow of evil," as the bishop and many others think, yet that typical reference must not at any rate be pressed beyond just warrant, and there is no warrant for assuming that because the Jews as a nation fell away, therefore the Church as a body, a corporation, will similarly fall away and similarly be destroyed. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her" said our Saviour. Why should we first assume the contrary, and then interpret prophecy to fit our own assumptions.

The second argument is St. Paul's language to the Thessalonians. But here again we ought to remember the state of the Church to which he was writing. They

had been expecting an immediate return to judgment, and in consequence were neglecting their ordinary duties; therefore St. Paul says that Return cannot be at present—not till after the Apostacy. And that Apostacy was not *of* the Church but *from* the Church—*within* the Church if you like, but at any rate not *of* the Church, as the first epistle to Timothy clearly shows, as indeed also does the famous passage in 2 Thessalonians, if only that passage be read by the aid of the light both of St. Paul's other epistles, and of history, and not by the aid of the darkness of commentators. To quote Mr. Jowett—a passage which made the late Dean Alford so very, very angry indeed—"such passages (Eph. vi. 12) are a much safer guide to the interpretation of the one we are considering, than the meaning of similar passages in the Old Testament. For they indicate to us the habitual thought of the Apostle's mind, 'a falling away first,' suggested probably by the wavering which he saw around him among his own converts, the grievous wolves that were entering into the Church of Ephesus (Acts xx. 29), the turning away of all of them of Asia (2 Timothy i. 15). When we consider that his own converts and his Jewish opponents were all the world to him,—that through them, as it were in a glass, he appeared to himself to see the workings of human nature generally, we understand how this double image of good and evil should have presented itself to him, and the kind of necessity which he felt, that Christ and Anti-Christ should alternate with each other. It was not that he foresaw some great conflict, decisive of the destinies of mankind: what he anticipated far more nearly resembled the spiritual combat in the seventh chapter of Romans. It was the same struggle, written in large letters, as Plato might have said, not on the tables of the heart, but on the scene around, the world turned inside out, as it might be described; evil as it is in the sight of God, and as it realises itself to the conscience, putting on an external shape, transforming itself into a person."

And then there is the imagery of the Apocalypse. But surely if ever Hooker's rule, to interpret obscure and difficult passages by clear and easy ones, not the clear and easy by the obscure and difficult, applies at all, it applies most of all here. For the whole of the Apocalypse is obscure and difficult. To this very day no absolute agreement can be made between the præterist school, the historical school, and the futurist school of interpreters. The first is most in favour with scholars now, and if so, that is fatal to the Bishop's argument so far; and it does not yet appear that the Scriptural argument for the "prophetic pessimism" of our first extract is entirely conclusive. But there remains the second extract, the argument from history. That extract is from the sermon on "The Vultures," preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, 17th February, 1878, and we would venture to ask the Bishop, why did he not, before writing it, read over his own excellent sermon (perhaps the best in the book) on "The Breaking Net," preached in St. Patrick's Cathedral, 29th September, 1868. It is over dead nations, dead families, dead churches, dead institutions, that the spiritual vultures gather, as he truly shows: and when church institutions have outlived their purposes then they too die, and over them too do the vultures gather. But just as the material vultures by "gathering over" material dead bodies, prevent the air from universal corruption; so the spiritual vultures, by gathering over the spiritual dead, prevent universal spiritual corruption. Institutions

do become corrupt, that we fully admit, nay, maintain; for "the old order changeth, giving place to new, and God fulfils Himself in many ways, lest one good custom should corrupt the world;" but then institutions are but as the net which broke, and broke necessarily almost. But what of it, even if institutions perish and will continue to perish, as they certainly will? Institutions never *cause* progress, though they may be useful as means. What if the net did break? If "prophetic pessimists" would only read on, they would see that in spite thereof, "they filled both the boats" with fishes.

THE Bishop of Worcester will hold a general ordination at the parish church of Bromsgrove, on Sunday, 21st September.

ON Thursday Mr. Chamberlayne, High Sheriff of Gloucestershire, laid the foundation-stone of a mission-room for St. Luke's, Gloucester.

A WINDOW, by Mr. Taylor, of Berners Street, has been presented to Yalding Church by Mrs. Baines, widow of the late vicar, as a memorial of her husband.

THE *Gloucester Chronicle* says that the Bishop of London has taken the rectory at Staunton, near Monmouth, where he has just arrived with his three daughters.

THE Western University of Canada, of which Bishop Hellmuth is Chancellor, has conferred the degree of D D. on the Rev. John Bennett, incumbent of Park Chapel, Chelsea.

THE Ven. George Mason has resigned the archdeaconry of Vancouver, British Columbia, and has been instituted to the Vicarage of Long Cross, Surrey, by the Bishop of Winchester, in whose hands the presentation has been placed by the patron, the Rev. W. Tringham.

A WINDOW, by Messrs. Warrington, of Fitzroy Square, has been placed in Westbourne Church, Hants. It bears the following inscription:—"To the glory of God and in loving memory of John Mee, M.A., Rector and Vicar of Westbourne, this window is dedicated by parishioners and friends. A.D. 1884."

ON Saturday a meeting of the subscribers to the Bishop Bickersteth Memorial Fund was held at Leeds, and it was decided that if £1,600 were raised a new west window should be placed in the cathedral as a tribute to the two first Bishops of the diocese—namely, Archbishop Longley and his lamented successor.

ON Monday week, a meeting of the Archdeaconry of Llandaff was held at Cowbridge, in aid of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Rev. J. H. Protheroe presiding. A short report was read by Precentor Wood, the secretary for the archdeaconry, who regretted that the bishop had not been able to attend as he had hoped. The report also gave a history of the efforts in aid of the society in the archdeaconry, and concluded with an announcement on the part of the archidiaconal secretary that he was desirous of relinquishing his office to some younger man, the appointment of an organising secretary for the whole of Wales (the Rev. T. Lloyd Williams) not lessening his own work.

THE Hon. and Rev. Maurice William Ferdinand St. John, vicar of Kempsford, Gloucester, has accepted the canonry at Gloucester rendered vacant by the

death of the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttleton. He is son of the late Hon. Ferdinand St. John, and a cousin of Viscount Bolinbroke. He was ordained in 1851. He was curate of Drigg, in Cumberland, 1851-2, and vicar of Frampton-on Severn 1853-1880. He is inspector of schools for the diocese of Gloucester. We believe that, under a new arrangement, he will reside eight months in the year.

THE Archdeaconry of London has been accepted by the Rev. Dr. Gifford, rector of Much Hadham, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. Dr. E. H. Gifford was fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, having graduated as Fifteenth Wrangler, Senior Classic, and Senior Medallist, 1843. He was formerly Head Master of King Edward's School, Birmingham, and has held successively Honorary Canonries at Worcester and at St. Albans, and a Prebendal Stall in St. Paul's Cathedral. He has been Select Preacher at Cambridge and at Oxford, and Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn, and is the author of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the "Speaker's Commentary."

THE restoration of Sherborné Abbey tower has made great progress, and the rebuilding of the east wall is now complete up to the parapet. Portions of the north and south walls have also been taken in hand simultaneously with the east, in order that the corners of the tower may be well bonded, and the utmost strength obtained at the angles. The west wall, which it is well known shows some larger cracks, and is besides much sunk in the centre, cannot be touched until next Spring. By that time it is hoped that the committee will have received further promises of support which will warrant them in proceeding with the remainder of the work. At present the subscriptions for next year amount to £1,760, and at least £2,000 more will be required.

IN the parish church of St. Mary's, Lambeth, there has been since 1608 a painted window representing a pedlar and his dog, a tradition stating that a pedlar left an acre of land to the church on condition that his portrait was thus preserved. Although some doubt has been cast upon this story, the fact remains that "Pedlar's Acre," a piece of land close to Westminster Bridge was bequeathed to the parish some centuries ago by a person whose name is unknown. Originally the land yielded only 4s. per year, but it now brings to the parish considerably over £1,000. The old window, which had been in the church for centuries, has however, just been taken out, by permission of the rector and churchwardens, in order to put up a memorial window to Mrs. Colambell and Mrs. Barker, the wives of a Lambeth doctor, and of the clerk to the churchwardens and overseers.

ON Thursday the Rev. Henry Hunter Hughes died at Layham, Suffolk, aged eighty-seven. He had been rector since 1836, having previously been Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated as Third Wrangler in 1817. His figure was a familiar one at Cambridge to, we may almost say, a generation gone by. He was editor of Professor Blunt's sermons.—On the same day the Rev. William Douglas Veitch, formerly Vicar of St. Saviour's, Paddington, died suddenly at Eliock House, Dumfries. He was the last surviving son of Mr. Henry Veitch, of Eliock, by marriage with Zephрина, daughter of Mr. Thomas Loughnan, of Madeira, and he was born in 1801. He graduated at Balliol College, Oxford, in 1823. He was for some time chaplain to the Bishop of Jerusalem, and he

held the living of St. Saviour's Paddington, from 1862 to 1873. He married, in 1828, Eleanor, daughter of Lieut.-Colonel Raitt, but was left a widower in 1876.

PREFERENCES AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Aldridge, Rev. William Wheeler, Vicar of Emmanuel, Weston-super-Mare.
 Dixon, Rev. James Murray, Rector of Swithland, Leicestershire.
 Esdaile, Rev. William, M.A., Assistant-Inspector of Schools for the Deanery of Merston.
 Fraser-Frizzell, Rev. R. F., Vicar of Millbrook, Rector of St. Allen, near Truro.
 Gifford, Rev. Dr., Rector of Much Hadham, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London; Archdeacon of London.
 Gough, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Virginstowe.
 Grundy, Rev. T. R., Rector of Teigngrace.
 Joy, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Vicar of Birstwith; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
 Kearney, Rev. Arthur Henry, Perpetual Curate of St. James, Haydock.
 Markham, Rev. A., Chaplain to the English Residents at Perak.
 Mason, Vén. George, Archdeacon of Vancouver; Vicar of Long Cross, Surrey.
 Mason, Rev. Ibbott Alfred, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Caru menellis.
 Milward, Rev. H. C., M.A., Chaplain of Berwick, Shrewsbury; Vicar of Redditch.
 Perry, Rev. E. M., Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Truro.
 Pudsey, Rev. F. W., Vicar of Masborough; Vicar of Stainton-in-Cleveland.
 Russell, Rev. Thomas, B.A., late Curate of St. James's, Leeds; Incumbent of St. John's, West Port, New Zealand.
 Rowley, Rev. William Walter, Vicar of Woolavington.
 St. John, Hon. and Rev. Maurice W. F., Vicar of Kempford, Gloucester; Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.
 Soyres, Rev. John de, Chaplain of the French Hospital, Victoria Park.
 Staekhouse, Rev. J. Lett, Curate-in-Charge of Berkeley, Gloucester, and Domestic Chaplain to Lord Fitzhardinge; Vicar of Christ Church, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire.
 Straffen, Rev. Robert, B.A., Vicar of St. John's, Ashley Green; Vicar of All Saints' with St. Lawrence, Evesham.
 Sumner, Rev. G., Curate; Vicar of St. James's, Lower Darwen.
 Sutton, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Pevensy, and Prebendary of Chichester; Rural Dean.
 Turner, Rev. Canon, Rector of Bradfield St. George with Rushbrooke; Rural Dean of the new Deanery of Horningsheath.
 Whitley, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Daresbury.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Antrobus, Rev. Edmund, late of Twiggell House, Northumberland, at Clifton, Bristol, on the 6th inst., aged 75.
 Brett, Rev. Thomas, at Glen View, Hastings, on the 3rd inst., aged 86.
 Cuthbert, Rev. George, Vicar of the Parish, very suddenly at the Vicarage, Llanllwchaearn, Montgomeryshire, on the 30th ult., aged 70.
 Davies, Rev. George Jennings, of Braishfield House, near Romsey, Vicar of Timsbury, at Wykeham House, Romsey, on the 8th inst., aged 59.
 Garrett, Rev. William T., M.A., youngest son of the late William Garrett, Esq., of Kilgarron, county Carlow, at Crakehall, Bedale, suddenly, on the 6th inst., aged 64.
 Reed, Rev. John, M.A., fifty-two years Vicar of the Parish, at Newburn Vicarage, Northumberland, on the 4th inst., aged 81.
 Skirrow, Rev. William, M.A., late Rector of Tolleshunt Knights, Essex, and formerly Vicar of Hincley, Leicestershire, at 9, Upper Westbourne Terrace, Hyde Park, on the 5th inst., aged 69.
 Stephen, Rev. Alfred, of Trinity College, Cambridge, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Redfern, and Canon of St. Andrew's Cathedral, eldest son of Sir Alfred Stephen, K.C.B., G.C.M.G., Lieut.-Governor of New South Wales, at Sydney, N.S.W., on July 16, aged 58.
 Veitch, Rev.-William Douglas, of Eliock, late Vicar of St. Saviour's, Paddington, at Eliock House, Dumfriesshire, on the 4th inst., aged 83.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ST. PAUL'S NEW DOCTRINE.

BY THE VERY REV. C. P. REICHEL, D.D., DEAN
OF CLONMACNOIS AND RECTOR OF TRIM, CO.
MEATH.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL,
DUBLIN, ON ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY, 1884.

"May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?"—ACTS xvii. 19.

THE context brings before us one of the most interesting scenes in the life of the great Apostle. Paul had been left alone at Athens by his own desire, as we learn from chapter iii. of his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, having sent back Timotheus to Thessalonica with a letter of comfort and encouragement to the newly founded Church there. And whilst he awaited his return, his spirit was stirred within him as he beheld the city wholly given to idolatry, beset with idols, as the original expression literally means. And in truth, Athens might well be regarded as the headquarters of idolatry; it was said by an ancient satirist, that there were there more gods than men; the statues of the deities were numbered, not by the hundred, but by the thousand; nor were these statues mere emblems, like the idols of Egypt or Hindostan, they were forms of exactest symmetry, models which all succeeding ages have despaired to imitate, many of them enshrined in temples the ruins of which still strike the traveller with amazement and delight. One of these, the Parthenon, or House of the Virgin (for the Greeks, too, had a virgin goddess, who at Athens almost superseded Zeus himself in the magnificence of worship), the Parthenon, I say, most conspicuous of all, crowned the summit of the Acropolis, or citadel, and the colossal statue of the goddess, armed in complete panoply of dazzling brass and gold, with an uplifted spear in her right hand, Athené the Defendress, was the first object that caught the traveller's eye as his bark slowly rounded the extremity of the pier, and entered the Piræus, the unequalled harbour which had been the seat of the Athenian empire, and was still the seat of her extensive commerce.

But the City of Athené was not merely the headquarters of idolatry in its most fascinating and least offensive form, in that aspect in which, unlike Oriental polytheism, it appealed neither to terror nor to sensuality, but to taste, in which it seemed not to degrade but to glorify humanity; it was also the headquarters of learning, of re-

search, and thought. It was the university of Greece, and not of Greece alone, but of the whole empire; the centre to which youths desirous of forming their minds and finishing their education streamed from every part of that vast dominion. For this office it had been trained and fitted by its history. Athens is for ever memorable as the birth-place of Greek resistance to Oriental despotism, of the successful fighting out of the battle of free thought and free action against the crushing power of mere numbers and brute force. But for that small town and its heroic resistance at Marathon and Salamis, there can be little doubt that a tyranny, such as we see in the book of Esther, would have extinguished freedom not only in Greece, but throughout the West, and the destinies of the world would have been changed. That Christianity is, as it is, a religion essentially of freedom and of free men (for even its most degraded form cannot help appealing to the right of free thought; every pervert to Rome is a triumph of private judgment)—that Christianity is inextricably intertwined with freedom, was decided centuries before Christ came, on those famous battlefields in which the Persian power was broken.

The little town which had achieved so much was naturally conscious of its achievements; they ruled its subsequent history. And most properly, for the first step downward in degradation is when a nation forgets the great deeds of its forefathers. The wondrous victory of mind over matter begat as wonderful a consequent development. A mental activity, of which we have hardly a conception, burst into sudden life; each Athenian felt himself, as such, a personage; and this feeling resulted not in idle self-glorification, but in an exuberance of intellectual and æsthetic effort the most marvellous the world has ever seen. Poetry, painting, statuary, architecture, led the way to the contentions of exacter thought; the great problems of existence made themselves felt, and were discussed with the most unfettered freedom. Athens became the home of the fine arts and of philosophy, which last took the place with them that religion does with us. For the religion of the Greeks was something entirely different from anything we should naturally understand under such a name. Unconnected with morality, except indeed in so far as the actions of its gods and heroes often contravened morality, it consisted in a round of ceremonial, handed down by tradition, the reasons for each particular of which, if they ever existed, were forgotten; the gods were propitiated by the accurate performance of certain rites, without the least attention being paid to the state of mind or feeling in which they were performed. It was the exact anticipation of the *opus operatum* of Roman Catholic theology. The teachings of this religion, if it taught anything at all on the subject of our responsibility here or our expectations hereafter, were confused and contradictory; they held out

no comfort to struggling virtue, no menace to triumphant vice. From religion, therefore, the awakened intellect of Greece had turned to philosophy to get an answer to those questions which always will rise in the human breast: What are we? Why do we exist? What will be our final destiny? And if the answers to these inevitable questions given by ancient philosophy were various and unsatisfying, let us recollect that philosophy has not advanced one step since then, and that its answers now are equally various and unsatisfying. For the philosophic or scientific schemes that are now claiming the obedience of minds not strong enough to see their deficiencies, are simply reproductions of the ancient systems with which the Athenians occupied or amused themselves; the efforts of unaided reason have got no farther; we know more about our bodies, but nothing more about our minds.

Availing himself of the philosophic freedom of discussion which characterised Greece in general and Athens in particular, Paul disputed not only with the Jews and Jewish proselytes, which he could only do in the synagogue, and on the Sabbath day, but every day of the week, and with everyone that would listen to him in the market-place. The agora, or market-place, in those ancient cities, and specially at Athens, was not a spot devoted to mere buying and selling, where discussions about the soul and God would have been out of place.* It was the heart of the city, where the news of the day was talked over, and all questions arising therefrom were determined. Encompassed with buildings of exquisite beauty, it had formerly been the centre of a glorious public life, where orators and statesmen, poets and artists, found all the incentives of their noblest enthusiasm; and it still continued to be the meeting-ground of idleness, of conversation, of business, of philosophy, when Athens could only feed on the remembrance of its glorious past. On one side of it was the Stoa, "the painted porch," from their frequenting which the Stoics derived their name; under venerable plane trees, which had been planted by the son of Miltiades, rose statues of the great men of antiquity; Solon the lawgiver, Demosthenes the orator, Cimon the admiral, and along with these, on elevated platforms, stood the long row of the Eponymi, or mythical heroes, after whom the Athenian tribes were named; whilst the central space was occupied by the altar of the twelve great gods. But not merely was the Agora thus consecrated. Every public place, every public building, was a sanctuary. The Record-house was the temple of the mother of the gods. The Council-house held statues of Phœbus and Zeus, and an altar of Vesta. The theatre was the temple of Dionysus and Bacchus. The place of assembly called the Pnyx, or Squeeze, from the way it used

to be crowded when the great orators declaimed there, was dedicated to the supreme Zeus. Even abstractions were deified and worshipped. Altars were dedicated to Fame, to Modesty, to Energy, to Persuasion, to Pity. This groping after the abstract and the invisible culminated in the dedication of an altar to "an Unknown God," to some deity or quality divine that might otherwise have found no place in the catholicity of their devotions.

This sanctuary of paganism, where every feeling of taste was gratified, every religious prejudice consulted, did Paul select for attacking the whole system. He could, indeed, say what he pleased without much danger of anything worse than ridicule, for the Athenians had learned one lesson; they had come to feel that the mind of man cannot be coerced, that speculation must not be prohibited, but guided. It is not wonderful, therefore, that certain philosophers of the two chief sects, Stoics and Epicureans, should have encountered the Apostle. Differing completely in their views of life, the philosophy of both was alike a philosophy of despair. The Epicurean held that the universe was created and ruled not by Providence but by Chance; that if there were any gods in it at all, they neither needed us nor cared for us; that the soul dies with the body; that there is therefore no reward for virtue, no punishment for wickedness in the future. The only end of man under these circumstances is enjoyment; virtue is in reality but a name, vice only a bug-bear. As to the character of the enjoyment, that must be determined by the disposition and capacity of each. To the intellectual the exercise of the intellect, to the sensual the pleasures of the senses, must be the end and aim; always indulged under the one restraint of prudence, for the purpose of securing the largest amount of gratification. Let us eat and drink, for we shall soon die; but let us eat and drink in moderation, lest we die too soon.

The Stoic system, on the other hand, laid down duty as its ideal. Though Fate superseded Providence, and no life after death gave prospect of reward or retribution, the idea of duty was nevertheless proudly flourished before the disciples of this stern doctrine. And, doubtless, there is something grand in a system which shrank not from the loftiest requisitions, though with no reward for compliance with them. But the duty of the Stoic, if sublime, is narrow; it admits no real sympathy; the wise man is concentrated in himself, he is to do what he believes to be right for himself, with no regard for others. The mass of mankind could never hope to attain this height, and therefore to the Stoic they were as worthless as the insect that gleams in the sun and dies at night. A religion of love, love to God and love to man, was simply incomprehensible to these austere philosophers: how could the Stoic love a being to whom he owed nothing, from whom he feared nothing, whose equal he boasted himself in everything

* See Conybeare and Howson's *Life of St. Paul*.

except brute force and longer duration of existence? How should he love his neighbour, whom, if he were not one of the few wise, he heartily despised? And thus all really humanising and civilising qualities were struck out of the soul by both these opposite sects; the system of mere ideal duty, just as much as that of mere pleasure, made men selfish, hard, unsympathising, and remorseless. I said before that these systems are re-appearing amongst ourselves. That Epicureanism should have votaries in every age is little wonderful. Every young man, every young woman, with whom the idea of amusement is first, and the idea of duty second, is practically a disciple of Epicurus. And are not such persons infinitely more blameable than the old philosopher, who had no revelation to save him from this quagmire? Are not those far more guilty who go astray after being taught better things? But a more curious sign of the times is the revival, though under another name, of the Stoic school. Epicureanism is the religion of our animal frame, and will always have votaries in those who are content to be mere animals. But Stoicism is cold and repellent, though it may recommend itself to our natural pride. Yet it is being revived by those who now teach, that to love God is impossible, seeing we cannot know Him; and to love our neighbour is absurd, seeing we cannot value him. The human race is at once too large and too small, too vast as a whole, too mean in its parts, to create affection. Each must do what is right in his own eyes, without caring for others, except as useful tools. Selfishness, whether the selfishness of pleasure or the selfishness of intellect, is thus again proclaimed as the true guide of life. And so it comes to pass that the words in which Paul assails at once the ignorance, the superstition, and the presumption of the Athenians are as significant and as instructive to us as they were to those to whom they were first spoken.

Of the philosophers who encountered him, some looked on him with supreme contempt—"What would this babbler say?" Others said, "He seemeth to be a setter-forth of foreign deities," apparently supposing that the Resurrection, which Paul preached, was the name of a goddess, who, together with Jesus, was recommended to the people's worship. So they brought him, gently and without violence or arrest, out of the busy hum of the market-place to the hill of Mars, where in former times the most awful and venerable court of justice known in Greece used to hold its midnight sessions. The judges sat in the open air, on seats hewn out of the solid rock, on a platform which was reached by a long flight of stone steps rising from the market-place. On this spot a long series of causes connected with crime and religion had been determined, beginning with the legendary trial of the god who gave to the place its name. His temple crowned the brow of the

eminence, and additional sanctity was lent to the place by the shrine of the Eumenides, as the Greeks tremblingly called the dread avengers of unnatural guilt, which was concealed in a cleft of the rock immediately under the judges' seats. Even in the decay of Athens this spot and this court were held in reverence and fear by all. It was a scene haunted with the recollections of centuries; a place of stern and silent awe in the midst of the gay and frivolous city; those who came there came, they felt, into the presence of a Higher Power. And though this was no judicial enquiry, yet the minds of many of the triflers who crowded up the steps along with the Apostle, and clustered round him on the top of the hill, may have been in some measure solemnised by the place in which they were, for the first time, to hear the eternal Gospel.

No scene in the first planting of Christianity is more interesting; whether we contrast the intense earnestness of the preacher with the frivolousness of those whom he addressed, to whom novelty was the one thing welcome; or the bald simplicity of his message with the complicated systems of pagan religion and philosophy; or the meanness of the form of "the little ugly Jew," as M. Renan calls him, with the beauty and grandeur of the figures of idealised humanity which here surrounded him, and which his success was destined to hurl from their thrones,—we cannot but feel that on this occasion the power of the seen and the power of the unseen universe were pitted against each other, each in their most appropriate form. Confronting the Parthenon, the grandest temple of antiquity, and standing almost under the shadow of the colossal bronze statue of Athené the Defender, the tutelary divinity of Athens, the Apostle had the courage to declare that the Deity dwelt not in temples made by hands, nor was to be deemed like either to that sublime work of Phidias, or to any of the other exquisite forms in gold, or silver, or ivory, or stone, graven by art and man's device, which peopled the scene before him. Yet it is most instructive to observe the delicacy and the prudence with which he commences an address intended to give a death-blow to all these refined idolatries:—

"Ye men of Athens, all things which I behold bear witness to your carefulness in religion. For as I passed through your city, and surveyed the objects of your worship, I found amongst them an altar dedicated to an Unknown God. Whom therefore ye worship without knowing Him, Him declare I unto you."

"God who made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is the Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is He served with the hands of men, as though He needed anything, for it is He that giveth unto all men life and breath and all things. And He made of one blood all the nations of mankind, to dwell

upon the face of all the earth, and ordained to each the appointed seasons of their existence, and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though indeed He is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live and move and have our being, as certain also of your own poets have said: 'For we also are his offspring.' Being, then, God's offspring, we ought not to think that the Divinity is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by the art and device of man."

"Howbeit, those past times of ignorance God overlooked, but now he commandeth all men everywhere to repent and change their course, because He hath appointed a day wherein He will judge the world in righteousness, by the Man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all, in that He hath raised Him from the dead."

Here the Apostle was rudely interrupted. Some of his hearers burst into derisive laughter. The idea of a physical resurrection was as ridiculous to the Greeks as the doctrine that all men were of the same value in the sight of God was hateful to the Jews. Others carelessly but courteously put off the Apostle to another time. They had had enough of him for the present. They had satisfied their curiosity; of truth they were not in quest.

But though at the moment unsuccessful, we may remark how well the Apostle's unfinished speech was adapted to his hearers. Each word is calculated at once to win and to rebuke. The Athenians were proud of their city and of their race. Paul tells them how much he has been struck with the beauty of their city; yet he warns them that God is equally the Father of all races. He approves of the care they took of religion; yet he admonishes them that idolatry, even in its most ideal form, degrades worship, and leads away from true notions of the Divine. The Epicureans might almost fancy they heard their Master when the Apostle spoke of the lofty and serene Divinity who needed nothing that man can give Him. But the very next sentence contravened the doctrine of Epicurus, inasmuch as it asserted that all things owed their origin and guidance to the creative energy, the all-ruling providence of God. And when the Stoics heard the Apostle say that men ought to rise to the contemplation of the Deity by an effort of the intellect, unassisted and undegraded by the senses, the proclamation of a truth he already knew and loved must have recommended to him another truth as yet strange to him, and probably unpalatable, the truth that God is not a mere impersonal principle or tendency, but a living personal centre of order and of love; that the world is ruled not by Destiny but by Deity; and that the proudest philosopher is not above the necessity of repentance and submission. Above all let us observe how the attention of the audience is drawn at last to the Saviour, though His name

does not occur:—"The Man whom God has ordained has been raised from the dead," to give assurance that the world is not ruled by chance; that vice and virtue are not equivalent, for that all mankind will be judged and all wrongs redressed by this Divine Deliverer and Avenger.

Let us devote a very few moments to the consideration of these topics of discourse.

(1) "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is He worshipped with men's hands as though he needed anything."

These words strike a death-blow to the system which makes worship consist chiefly in ritual and ceremony. It is not true that God dwelleth not in temples made with hands, if He dwells especially in consecrated buildings; if His presence is localised upon the altar. It is not true that God is not worshipped with the hands, if the essentials of Christian worship are certain rites performed in a certain manner; if ceremonial be anything more than the outward dress, necessary, like all dress for decency and order, but having no intrinsic relation to the inner and spiritual realities whose outward dress it is. God is a Spirit, and it is the spirit alone that can truly worship Him. In the worship of a spirit by a spirit, bodily demeanour can have no intrinsically necessary function; we kneel when we pray, because kneeling happens to be the conventional attitude of reverence; but the reverence may be felt when it is impossible to kneel, and the kneeling may be there without the reverence. We use water when we baptise, but baptism is not the washing with water, but the answer of a good conscience towards God; we eat bread and drink wine to commemorate our Master's atoning death, but we have no right to fancy that the bread and wine are converted into our Master's body and blood, any more than we have to believe that the water in the other sacrament is converted into that Holy Ghost whose purifying influence it represents. If we wish to celebrate these ordinances, but are unable to do so, our wish for them is enough to procure for us all their blessing, whilst the mere external celebration of them, no matter how regular and orderly it be, will draw down no blessing where the spirit is wanting which ought to animate them. A religion of ceremonial may, like that of the Athenians, minister to art, may amuse and occupy the attention, and yet be utterly destitute of moral power. Taste was gratified by the bright spectacle to which the Athenian awoke every morning of his life. Excitement was kept up by festal seasons, gay processions, solemn sacrifices. But all this religious dissipation had no tendency to make him holy. It gave him no victory over sin, it brought him no nearer to the Deity. The most shameless profligacy—vices without a name—could exist along with it; the most callous immorality could saturate a life steeped in ceremonial. And so it is still. Captured Greece captured her fierce conqueror, as Horace said, and

so captured heathenism captured the conquering Church. Every abomination catalogued in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans flourished vigorously in countries where every tenth person used to be a priest or monk, where God is worshipped as though He did indeed dwell especially in temples made with hands, and is even exhibited to the people for their adoration, enclosed, *imprisoned* (it is their own word) in the pyx upon the altar.

And in our own country what fruits do we see of the same system of religion? The most regular attendance at chapel, and the most unscrupulous ruffianism organised and practised outside it; piety and murder, devotion and dishonesty, walking hand in hand; the religion which cringes before a priest, and virtually denies every reality of the name and character of God.

Nor is this anything peculiar to Ireland. It was on this very day, a little more than 300 years ago, that the tocsin for the massacre of heretics was sounded from the belfry of a Parisian church, and the murderers on that most awful morning recognised each other by a white cross—the emblem of salvation!—fastened upon their hats! Such are the fruits of a religion of ceremonial and priestcraft!

(2) From these false conceptions of God's character and worship, and from all the vicious practices therewith connected, "God commandeth men everywhere to turn away, because He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world by that Man whom He hath fore-ordained, whereof He hath given proof, in that He hath raised Him from the dead."

Observe how St. Paul, here as elsewhere, makes the Gospel centre in the Resurrection of our Saviour. The future judgment depends upon it. Our life after death depends upon it. "If Christ be not raised, our faith is vain; we are yet in our sins; they that have fallen asleep in Christ," after a life dedicated to God and goodness, "are all perished." In that case we Christians are indeed, of all men, the most miserable. Christianity, as conceived by Paul, exhibits itself not as a religion of mere sentiment and feeling; not even as a religion of the purest morality only. It goes beyond the merely spiritual into the domain of history. It is strictly an historical religion interwoven with the whole history of man, resting ultimately on one great historic fact to which a whole system of other facts converge.

No doubt this historic fact is, in itself, if taken alone, in the highest degree improbable. And so the Stoics and Epicureans, who for the first time heard of it, thought, and when they heard it, they laughed at it in derision. And this is the way in which impugnors of our faith generally choose to regard it. They *isolate* the Resurrection, and then say the proof of it is insufficient. But this is not the way to view it. That single fact must be

regarded as one part of a large, complex structure, composed of the whole history and literature of the consecrated nation, and of the foundation and fortunes of the Christian Church. It must be regarded in connection with those spiritual issues which in the New Testament are everywhere represented as depending on it. It is not improbable that God should judge the world in righteousness, as it is certainly not judged at present, and if so there must be a future state. It is to the last degree improbable that a God of righteousness and justice, and as such only can we conceive of God without absolute horror—injustice, armed with omnipotence, is the most awful conception the human mind can entertain—it is to the last degree improbable, I say, that a God of justice should provide no redress for the wrongs of this present state; that he should have created beings whose apparent destinies can never be fulfilled, whose anticipations, if they do anticipate anything good, are baseless; whose race is doomed to resultless extinction when life on this planet shall become impossible, as science knows it ultimately must. The conception which those must entertain who believe in nothing beyond what they see is this, that the highest existences on this earth are the least perfect, because they never reach their ideal here, as do the lower animals: that man is literally the only being whose powers are never completely developed, never adequately used, whose wishes are never entirely gratified, whose aspirations are invariably disappointed; that morality, except in so far as it is mere selfishness, is a delusion; that vice is as necessary as virtue, if indeed it be not absurd to talk of vice or virtue at all; that we are infinitely worse off than the beasts that perish, because like them we perish, but unlike them we anticipate our perishing, and are made wretched by the thought. *This* is the last result of the supposed exaltation of the human intellect against what unbelievers call the degrading system of Christianity! This is the outcome of the philosophy that rejects the Resurrection of the Saviour as a Jewish ghost story! Not that all unbelievers see in all its hideousness this gospel of despair, but that these are its real features may be perceived by anyone who will study the works of the chief writers of this school.* "We are still living," thank God, "in the twilight of Religion; and the grim features of Evolution are not yet distinctly seen,"† though the dark shadow cast on human life and effort by it is visible even in its least cynical apostles; and if their doctrine should ever supersede the teachings of Paul and John and Christ, then the sun will be indeed eclipsed, and the blackness of darkness will overspread creation.

* E.g., Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen, etc.; not to mention the German pessimists, Schopenhauer, V. Hartmann, etc.

† See an article in the December number of the *Contemporary Review*, 1883, by Mr. Goldwin Smith.

Realise then, I beseech you, the true drift of the tendency which is now sweeping on so many young intellects unconsciously; realise the true meaning and claims of Christianity, as a religion of historic fact, not of vague and baseless sentiment; a religion, too, of the spirit, not of the body; let nothing tempt you to abandon your confidence in Him whom Christ and Christ alone has revealed to you as "your Father which is in heaven;" look for Him, not in rites and ceremonies, which like "meats," however necessary for a time, must "perish with the using," but in the devotion of the heart and the formation of that mind and character that was in Christ. Then, when the Judge shall appear, and you shall be manifest before Him and all, you will enter on a life to be spent in His presence, a life of eternal progress and victory, purity and peace.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1884.

THE CHURCH AND OVERCROWDING.

WE have frequently impressed upon our readers the important fact that one great aim of the Christian, as well as the Jewish dispensation, was to save men's bodies as well as their souls, that Moses and Christ were *sanitary* reformers first, and *moral* reformers afterwards. Furthermore we have held, contrary to the beliefs of several of our respected subscribers, that the human nature is such that it is impossible to attain to any great moral reformation without first inducing a large measure of physical improvement in man's body. The effects of health upon morals should no more be ignored by the Church of Christ than the great and undoubted effects of morals on physical health. From the nature and extent of Moses' excellent sanitary laws and observances we hold that we are justified in inferring that the

"cleanness" and the "holiness" at which he expressly aimed included a considerable amount of physical health, as is evidenced by the teaching of the Jewish Rabbis and people of the present day. Our Saviour's commandment was "To heal the sick; to cleanse the lepers; to preach the Gospel." Moreover we are told that He came to "save the people from" (the effects of) "their sins." Can it be that the Church, especially the Church of England, has failed of anything like complete success in the contest with sin and unbelief, because she has obeyed only the latter half of the great commission of her Head? Half-measures—not to lay stress upon the fact that the measure of merely preaching puts the cart before the horse—like half-truths, are generally speaking, the most injurious of all enterprises. Who for instance would build a house without a foundation, or a locomotive engine without a boiler? It is equally foolish to attempt the moral edification and perfection of man without bestowing some consideration and pains on the strength and ability of his body, which is the machine or organ by means of which all the mental and moral faculties execute their work. Every efficient school now recognises the fact that in order to develop the mental faculties it is necessary to have a care for the physical health of boys and girls. Nature herself always grows and perfects her works at one and the same time as whole and not as half-measures. Even her handiwork would perhaps be considerably marred if executed by instalments—if, for instance, she formed first the right half and then the left half of a man's body. It is true that our Prime Minister is attempting to carry a half-measure of Reform, and has persuaded his supporters that he can subsequently perfect the other half; but the House of Lords suspends this half-measure until they know what the other half is to be, and wisely, as we think, distrusts Mr. Gladstone's "wishes, hopes, and promises, the currency of idiots!" Holding these views as to the unwisdom, impolicy, and injuriousness of executing half-commands, half-plans, and half-measures, we rejoice to see that in the coming Congress the Church will essay to fulfil the first and hitherto most neglected half of her Lord's great Commission. The first subject to be discussed at Carlisle is "The duties of the Church with regard to the overcrowded dwellings of the poor in towns and in the country"—a subject which is of more importance in its moral and educational than in its sanitary aspect. In whatever aspect they are regarded, we trust they will not be considered as mere secular duties, and dismissed as of little or no concern to the Church of God. We also hope that the occasion will not be used by the Christian Socialists to ventilate their crude and false notions, that property in land differs from any other kind of property, such, e.g., as the produce of the land. The duties of the Church in this matter,

we take it, are very simple—to teach the evil effects of overcrowding, to assist in putting in force the sanitary law for its prevention, and to stimulate the provision of adequate and decent house-accommodation for the poor. As regards health, we must candidly admit that a man's house is not a matter of very great importance, "his body is more than" (house or) "raiment." We trust therefore that this is only the first and not the final step that the Church will take in a sanitary direction, but that it will be followed by well-directed and strenuous efforts to eradicate from man's body the great hereditary diseases which make such terrible havoc of Englishmen. If we regard the blindness, deafness, idiotcy, lunacy, and consumption, which now so largely prevail amongst English churchmen, as temporal and worldly afflictions of little moment, we hold that the great moral and mental good which will accrue to her sons from their prevention would more than compensate the Church for her exertions.

SHALL WE CHANGE THE PRAYER BOOK?

(From a Clerical Correspondent.)

VARIOUS attempts have been and are being made of late years to alter our Prayer Book to suit party views. Some would alter it in a High Church direction, others in a Low. Practically neither have succeeded as yet, and probably nothing less than disestablishment would effect it. It is true minor alterations have been made. The Lectionary has been re-arranged, and this re-arrangement has been authorised by Act of Parliament. Shortened services have also been authorised. But it is felt by both parties that these changes do not really touch the root of the question. The wishes of the combatants have not been yielded to, and the good sense of the nation still holds the balance between them.

Meanwhile the Church of England, still advancing upon the basis of the Prayer Book, is making rapid strides. The same prayers which delighted our forefathers resound in our ears. The same Communion Service is read. The Baptismal, Confirmation, and Burial Offices are unaltered. The Catechism is there, the Thirty-nine Articles, in all their ruggedness, read and understood by few, are there too. The Ordination Services for deacons and priests, the Consecration Service for bishops and archbishops are there in their integrity. The Litany is the same, so is the Penitential Office for Ash Wednesday, the shorter services for the Churching of Women, the Visitation and Communion of the Sick. There, too, are the Athanasian Creed, the Marriage Service, and the Office for the Queen's Accession. On the whole it remains the same, and time has endued it all with a halo of reverence. With much around us that is new, progressive, rapidly progressive, the devotions which contented our ancestors practically content ourselves.

Amid all this turmoil a reflective mind will naturally ask the question, "Is it all thus to continue? Is no change to be made? In the interests of the Church is it wise to make no change, and blindly to resist every effort in that direction?" It is difficult to give a satisfactory answer. Some will say, "Yes, if we

are to prosper a change must be made in a High Church direction." Others will counsel as strongly the Low or Evangelical tendency. The majority probably are contented with things as they are, and ask no change. What is the common sense view? What is really for the best interests of the Church? Change or no change, elasticity or rigidity, Conservative churchmanship or Liberal churchmanship? All profess to have the best interests of the Church at heart, but the voices of our counsellors differ. One advises this, another that, until amid the strife of tongues one's head is almost in a whirl.

Now, it is probable that if the Church were perfectly free to act, a great council would be held, the question thoroughly threshed out, a conclusion come to and the matter set at rest. But the Church is not thus free to act. Church is bound by Parliament. Parliament is not over friendly. Our advisers caution us to keep the subject out of Parliament if we can. And so the matter rests. All agree that something may have to be done, many insist that something *must* be done, but the overshadowing fear of Parliament prevents any effectual steps being taken. We have come to a dead lock, and that is where the dead lock is—the door of the House of Commons. We could open that door if we would, but it is only too possible that if we once entered it we might afterwards regret having taken so rash a step. "Marry in haste, repent at leisure" is a good old proverb that has its application here. If a man, or woman either, rashly enters the holy estate, a good deal of unavailing repentance may follow. If we once open the door of Parliament with our Prayer Book question, it may bring a swarm about our ears and disturb all our comparative peace.

The question here naturally arises, "Is it good that the development of the Church should be checked by Parliament? Would it be better for us that the bands which unite the two should be severed?" Here again is a grand question upon which opinions differ as widely as the poles. One says, "Yes, it would be far better for Church and State to be separated, and for each to take its several way." Another warns that it would be the death knell for each. Which are we to believe? Each speaks with confidence, emphasis, perfect assurance which, as we listen will admit of no manner of doubt. We are placed in a perfect dilemma. Even our preconceived opinions which we have so fondly hugged are for the moment at least tottering in our minds. We wish to say the right word and do the right thing at this critical emergency. Can it possibly be that with the best intentions we have chosen the wrong?

It must be carefully borne in mind that the advocates of severance between Church and State are almost without exception our opponents. Those who would retain the bond, numbering some of the wisest and most far-seeing of our clergy and laity, are our friends. It is perilous to reject the advice of a sincere friend and to accept the counsels of a crafty and unscrupulous foe. Common prudence would warn us *quieta non movere*. Must we then in this railroad age go on with the old machine, even though it creaks a little? It would seem so, unless anything very unexpected should occur. There is nothing for it, there is no alternative. No change, however imperative and agreeable to the mind of the Church, can be made without Parliament. Every voice warns us not to cross swords with Parliament or invoke its aid. So we hang back and who shall say we are wrong in

doing so when every voice, whether of friend or foe, concurs in telling us that such a course in our own interests is the wisest?

Now, what changes in the Prayer Book are at all imperative? And are these changes changes of expansion or of diminution? Are we to add to its provisions or are we to lop its branches? The Athanasian creed for instance. Some persons, staunch English Churchmen, cling to it with the tenacity of a bull-dog. Others, who consider themselves equally staunch English Churchmen, hate it with an intensity of hatred, and show their repugnance to it at every available opportunity. What are we to do about this? If we omit the Creed of Saint Athanasius we offend one section of Church people, and that probably not the least considerable, enthusiastic and valuable. If we retain it we offend another section who possess considerable weight in the country. Is there any way of contenting both parties? Can no compromise be found which should bring peace? Would a re-translation effect this most desirable object? or would the optional use? or would both these combined? This question I do not pretend to answer; I only am trying to show the difficulty of the problem, to gather together some of the various suggested solutions, and am sure that time and discussion in a calm, fair, kind and friendly spirit will bring us to the desired haven.

There are signs abroad that this discussion about the Athanasian Creed, which not so long ago raged so strongly, is again coming to the front. But there is another debate still more recent, still continuing with great force, which demands a solution. I mean the table of affinity. A Bill with the intention of legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister is constantly coming before Parliament. It is being as constantly defeated. But the divisions are often very close, and an uneasy consciousness prevails that we may wake some fine morning to find it the law of the land.

Now with regard to this question, it is a very curious fact, that the opponents of the measure appeal to the Bible in support of their opposition, and the supporters of the measure appeal with equal confidence to the sacred page in defence of their opinions. The former assert that it is the law of the Church; the latter that every civilized and Christian country, almost without exception, including every colony and dependency of the British Empire, has adopted the practice and finds no inconvenience to result from such adoption. Here then is another dilemma. Which horn are we to take hold of? What solution can we find to a problem in which the respective disputants are so confident, and lay claim to such unerring infallibility. Is the last leaf of the Prayer Book, commencing "A man may not marry his grandmother," to be torn out or left in? Many an enthusiastic clergyman or churchwarden has had this last leaf printed in big letters and hung over the Vestry mantelpiece as if it were an appropriate object of study for a reflective clergyman pondering over his winter evening sermon while the congregation are assembling for service. Time will solve this, as other questions, no doubt. Meanwhile what is our duty? That is the question we all ask ourselves, and I don't pretend to be able to answer a question that has puzzled wiser heads than mine. "*Solvitur ambulando*."

Then again there is that ornament's rubric staring us in the face as we open the Prayer Book every Sunday morning service. It certainly enjoins more than is usually to be found in our churches.

But when one has recourse to a court of law, we are told that an affirmative means a negative, which is an acuteness of reasoning that baffles an ordinary mind. Ordinary people term it "swearing black's white."

The utter absurdity of such a process has become so palpable that the opponents of the rubric in question have sought refuge in the only straight forward course, and advocate either its modification or its total abolition.

Now let us turn to another point, and that not the least important in the Prayer Book—the Communion Service. To those who have been brought up in the constant and reverent use of it from their Confirmation Day onward nothing could in their estimation (speaking for the majority at least) be more beautiful or comforting. It seems to satisfy every possible requirement. Worship, closest union with the risen Saviour, communion with one another, peace with all the world and in the inmost heart, love inexpressible toward man and our loving Father in heaven, refreshment, rest, renewed strength, all these and so much more. Why change in any way what is so glorious, satisfying, and beautiful? This is the first natural exclamation at the bare idea. As well try to modernise some of that grand old stained glass of the middle ages, the secret of its hues having died with its makers.

But one class of innovators will reply, "We don't want to modernise at all. On the contrary, we wish to revert more nearly to those middle ages which you praise so much. We ask for the alternative use of the Communion Service in an earlier Prayer Book."

When we look into those earlier Prayer Books we find, of course, a closer approach to the Latin Mass. The cope, the reception of the sacred elements in the mouth, not in the hand, the Agnus Dei, the unleavened bread, the eastward position, the words of administration from which commemoration is eliminated, and in which the corporeal Presence is suggested. These and such-like points strike us at a glance, and the question we naturally ask is just that of the foremost of modern politicians, "Are we going to Canossa again?"

But to turn to a less exciting subject.

The renewed life of our Church in these days of ours (which is confessedly due to the High Church or Oxford movement) has led to the introduction of a number of services performed by clergymen of the Church of England that have no manner of authority from the Book of Common Prayer. But these services are quietly acquiesced in by all parties, and even imitated by the opponents of ritual. These are in particular penitential services for penitential seasons, notably the three hours' service on Good Friday, special services in parishes where missions are being held, and occasional services, such as Harvest Thanksgivings, Consecrations or Restorations of Churches, etc. In many cases these Services are expressly authorised by the Diocesan—in many cases—possibly the most—people do as they please. It is a question whether it would not be well in any future revision of the Prayer Book to authorise certain services for such special occasions, leaving, however, a margin for individual enterprise and differing times, customs, and places.

A children's service is surely much wanted. And a few pages might be devoted with advantage to private devotion.

Might not also a few of the best known hymns for morning and evening, Sundays, the greater festivals

and fasts, and for children, be added with advantage? But as we said before, nothing can be done without Parliament, and to Parliament we dread to go.

Alterations and additions thus resolve themselves into two grand divisions—controversial and non-controversial. If we have to go to Parliament at all, and want a peaceful and practical result, what is our proper course? Clearly to take the non-controversial and omit the controversial. The latter time will smoothe.

We look forward to the future with the consciousness that great changes are looming. We want to do the best for our Church and nation. But when we look round and see what strides our Church has made in every department of her work, what new life is stirring in her breast, and what devotion is genuinely felt for her welfare among the thousands upon thousands of her faithful children, we thank God and take courage. We anticipate for our Church a future that shall compare with no diminution of lustre with her glorious past. We see her abounding in good works. And when a Church abounds in good works arising from purity of faith and steadfastness in religious walk and life, one cannot think she is perishing or likely sorely and soon to err from the right path.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REFORM OF CONVOCATION.

SIR,—As a layman I heartily thank you for printing the Rev. A. D. Pringle's liberal and catholic letter on this subject of pressing importance. I say "pressing" because if Convocation be not quickly made an assembly representative of the whole church, laity as well as clergy, as in Apostolic times, the sooner it is altogether suppressed the better. The time and talents of our bishops and other church dignitaries would be far more profitably employed in Parliament and in their ordinary duties, than in discussing and imposing clerical-made laws on the Church.

The Church of England is even now better represented in the British Parliament than in its mis-styled Convocations. If there is to be reform let it be on the lines advocated by Dr. Barry, Bishop of Sydney, an extract from whose speech at his first Diocesan Synod I subjoin:—

CLERGY AND LAITY.

And one other ancient tradition I must briefly touch upon, which, unlike the other, is more fully carried out here than in the land of its birth. I mean the recognition of both clergy and laity as having rights and duties—in some sense co-ordinate—in the work of the Church. Of clergy: for no natural disinclination to magnify ourselves should prevent our proclaiming the undoubted historical fact, that from the beginning the work of the ministry has not been a simple function, but has implied a distinct order; and that whatever may have been the rights of personal selection, their solemn mission has been given, not by delegation from the whole congregation, but by ordination in the name of Christ—from Himself first, from His Apostles by His authority, and by those who have succeeded from age to age in the line of the ministry. Call it by what name you will, this is unquestionably a great fundamental law of the Church; and on this mission, with the gift which seals it, depend these rights of the clergy, of which (be it remembered) in each generation they are not possessors, but trustees. Of laity: for nothing is to my mind clearer than that to the whole body of the Church belongs the right of Church government in the largest sense—in matters of faith as well as matters of discipline—in all, in fact, that trenches not on the direct Ministerial functions of the clergy. At home, as you know, from causes on which I need

not here dwell, that right has in some points, perhaps the most important, fallen into abeyance. Here it is distinctly and practically realised, as the very existence of the synod shows; and that it is so I rejoice without a moment's hesitation or reserve. Both powers are surely to be carefully and even reverently preserved. No doubt here again to harmonise both may involve difficulty. It is simple enough to make the clergy absolute, at least in theory; it is equally simple to make them the mere delegates of the laity. Simple both these extremes, but neither of them is true; neither of them can be carried on without fatal results to the very life of the Church. It is for the clergy to recognise freely and ungrudgingly the right of the laity even when in doubt whether it is wisely used—even when it may thwart our own energy and cross what we may think our best way of working for the Master; even when, as in the vocation of life, the ideas of experts and the judgment of those who are in the old sense of the word "laymen" come into some collision. Yet not less necessary is it for the laity to respect even zealously the rightful independence of the clergy—on which, perhaps, at this moment more than on anything else, depends the question of their highest efficiency for their sacred work, even if again they find it in some things cross their own tastes and opinions—even if they doubt whether it is always exercised with humility and wisdom. We must trust each other, and we must respect each other, and we must hold that the work of the Church is the common work of us all, and that power can only be rightly held or really maintained at the cost of labour and sacrifice.

MEDICUS.

SIR,—All the laity of the Church of England are greatly indebted to the Rev. A. D. Pringle for his excellent letter on the reform of Convocation. Members of every religious body, every society, every profession, and every trade, have more or less a voice by vote in the general management, excepting the members of the Church of England. Either the laity must be admitted into Convocation, or disestablishment will be the penalty.

TRUTH.

THE LONDON MISSION.

SIR,—I trust that your leading article upon the "London Mission" will be read by every churchman in London. You have very clearly shown that, if the "mission" is to do any lasting good, every member of the Church of England (especially the clergy) should at once prepare for the reception of new and strayed old members of the Church of Christ.

That a "mission" is wanted is patent to all living in the east or north of London. It having been my lot to live at Hoxton all my days, perhaps a few lines upon the Church of England in Hoxton, past and present, may not be out of place.

Twenty-five years since the parish of St. John's, Hoxton, consisted of a very large district; the clergy were, the vicar, curate, and a Sunday curate; the congregation on Sunday mornings generally numbered about 1,500. There are now six additional churches, whose parishes have been entirely or in part formed out of that of St. John's of 1859. Two or three clergymen are at each of these churches, yet after all I find that the present Sunday morning congregations of St. John's, St. Peter's, St. Columba's, St. Mary's, St. Saviour's, St. Anne's, and St. Andrew's all put together amounts to about 1,000.

We have now fifteen to twenty clergymen instead of three, branches of the E.C.U. and C.E.W.M.S., many thousands more people crowded into the houses, and Church attendance decreased by one third. When one finds less than fifty men, women, and children in two, and less than one hundred in three others of the Churches above named, while hundreds of people are walking through the streets in which

these Churches are built, one question only can be asked, Why is this?

As a layman I feel that all the fault of empty churches, does not rest with the people. Many of the clergy forget that they should be "all things to all men," and seem to fancy themselves to be "infallible popes" in the midst of the inhabitants of Sodom. No matter how hard the layman may work, how often his hand may be in his pocket, he is by no means, in the eyes of some clergymen, fit to stand in the same street, or in any way able to have a voice in church affairs with themselves.

These "infallible popes" sometimes not only fail to "take a city" into their churches, but often drive a good congregation away by not being able to "rule their spirit." They are so used to rule everything, that when a lay-helper dares to suggest anything, he is at once snubbed, and temper is shown on both sides. The result is in nine cases out of ten a good Sunday school teacher resigns, and if he has a class of senior boys, many of them also cease to attend school and church. This is not fancy; when lads get 15 or 16 years of age, a little indiscretion exercised towards their teacher is often resented by their leaving.

I have known "infallible popes" very changeable, one day agreeing with their lay-helpers upon a certain plan, while the next day they would cancel all, in order to please perhaps some person outside the work. Some of the best Sunday school superintendents that the North of London ever had have been discouraged in this way.

Again jealousy is not unknown among these "infallibles"; sometimes a curate is too good a preacher, or a lay-helper is elected to the same guardian-board as the vicar: this is not right; the one receives notice, the other is offered the cold hand of the "infallible."

Above all, these "popes" are most "infallible" concerning the singing in the churches. Often the organist and choir aspire to more singing; the vicar generally gives way to them, without in the least troubling to study the rest of the congregation. This I have known to drive many people from the Church of England altogether. Depend upon it, what is required is a true Protestant service in our churches; not so much of the "dress," but a little life in the "address"; not so much of the concert, but more of the people's voice ("All people that on earth do dwell"); not so much talk about, and bowing to the "altar," but more of the teaching that "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

ALFRED COLE.

Hoxton, Sept. 15th, 1884.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—I am asked whether I can give any cogent reasons why our Gospel of St. Mark cannot have been written in the first quarter of the second century. Before endeavouring to reply I would like to ask whether this date is named as the latest date possible on any hypothesis that can be called reasonable, or that approves itself to "F. T. P.'s" judgment, or whether it is suggested as a date for which there is some external or internal evidence.

I do not wish to accept definitely the position that commends itself to "F. T. P.," that Mark's was the earliest of the three Synoptic Gospels, but I suppose I may assume that it belongs at any rate to a period

not later, to signify, than Matthew or Luke. To establish the date of the two latter, then, would practically answer the question. "F. T. P." speaks of Luke as possibly the author of the "we sections" of the Acts (see his letter of June 28th). If he holds that these "we sections" were at least the *bonâ fide* work of a companion of Paul, then if we remember the use of the first person singular in the prefatory words of Acts and Luke, and the strong peculiarities of phrase which distinguish the Lucan writings from the rest of the New Testament, which appear decidedly in the "we sections" (see my letter of May 10th), then I see no probable hypothesis which will not limit the time when the third Gospel can have been written by the date to which it is possible that a companion of Paul can have lived to. Did anyone, in order to father a Gospel on one not an eye-witness, actually translate all the important matter peculiar to the third Gospel and a greater part of the Acts into Lucanese? If the "we sections" be doubted, must we suppose that with the same improbable object the writer went over the ground, or rather the water, so as to be correct in local details. It is dangerous to assert universal negatives, and I therefore speak under correction in saying that I do not remember to have heard of any Apocryphal Gospel attributed to an author not supposed to be an eye-witness. An author chosen according to fancy, would, according to this test, have been Pilate rather than Luke. In the light of this fact, if fact it be, Justin Martyr's statement that the Memoirs were "written by the Apostles and those who followed them," seems to point pretty strongly to Luke and Mark, and though "F. T. P." and I are mainly in accord about Justin's use of the Synoptic Gospels, he seems to doubt whether Justin assigned them to the authors after whom they are now named.

According to Dr. Sanday the weight of authority is in favour of putting Justin Martyr's martyrdom about 148 or 150 A.D., and if the Dialogue with Trypho have any basis of fact in its accessories, Justin Martyr was a well-informed Christian, or at any rate a Christian, at the time that Barcocheab's rebellion had been quelled. I think therefore that Justin Martyr's evidence belongs to the earlier half of the second century rather than the later half. Now as "F. T. P." grants me that Justin used our Synoptic Gospels, there are two reasons for supposing that they belong to a period decidedly earlier than Justin's. One is his addition of one or two Apocryphal details. The other is much more important, viz, that Justin's quotations show an affinity with codex D., with the earlier copies of the Old Latin Version, and with the Curetonian Syriac, in other words with the Western family of manuscripts. Now as these readings are, in the judgment of text critics, corruptions, not genuine readings, it follows that before Justin's day the Western family of manuscripts had branched off from the Alexandrine. Before families of manuscripts can have arisen, the Gospels must have attained some name and fame. If they were not commended by the Apostles to the Churches, they probably had some struggle for existence before they attained this position, seeing that "many had taken in hand to set forth" the Gospel history. Of course if they were recommended by the Apostles, their early date follows. If they were not; reckon back from Justin to the division between the families of manuscripts, from that—a short way perhaps—to the recognition which made such extensive transcription possible, and from

that, through the probable struggle for existence to the first writing of these Gospels, and I think you will put them by highly probable inference well within the lines of the first century. Marcion's use of Luke's Gospel again points to the use of this Gospel as well established, inasmuch as Marcion was a heretic. The Gospel seems to have had a pretty firmly founded reputation when it was used alike by heretics and orthodox; but this is by no means all, for the argument from textual criticism applies more clearly in the case of Marcion than of Justin: as in Justin's case, so in Marcion's, the affinities of the text are clearly Western, and the same argument applies. I cannot but think it likely that there was some rudimentary formation of a New Testament Canon before the families of manuscripts began to diverge.

I have spoken in a former letter of the recognition of our Gospels by the heretics of the Second Century, as in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, where traces of all four Gospels may be found; in Basilides and his followers, by either or both of whom Luke and John were used; nor am I aware that there is any good ground for doubting the statement of Tertullian in the *De Præscriptione*, that Valentinus, in contradistinction to Marcion's mutilations of the New Testament writings, used "*integro instrumento*." Such widespread recognition, both in and outside the Church, could not easily have grown up since the beginning of the second century, for documents touched up by some unknown editor. A similar, though hostile, recognition may be found in what we know of the writings of Celsus, the opponent of Christianity, where there are traces of the use of all four Gospels; at least such I understand from Dr. Sanday to be the opinion of Keim and Volkmar.

We must remember that Christians did not all live in one town or one country, and that general recognition of a Gospel, unless well authenticated is likely to have been a plant of slower and slower growth as the Church was spreading farther and farther. I am half-ashamed to refer again to the state of the Canon at the end of the second century, as well as to the evidence that the text had then a history of some considerable duration behind it.

To the evidences I have offered of the genuineness of the third Gospel "F. T. P." mentions a possible addition, namely, a large amount of coincidence in language between St. Luke and St. Paul, but says that orthodoxy will suppose that Luke derived this similarity from a study of Paul's Epistles. I am in no position to say whether any orthodox writers have maintained this position, but those who, like me, whether orthodox or not, believe strongly in the "*Horæ Paulinæ*," will suppose rather that Luke had scarcely seen the Epistles, and that the coincidence of language came from constant intercourse and constant hearing. I hope to say more about Papias next week; meantime I wish to say that I think the evidence for the early date of the Gospels particularly strong, so my "moderation" must not be mistaken.

ERIGENA.

THE *Gloucester Chronicle*, noticing the marriage of Dr. Wilkinson, rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham, and hon. canon of Worcester, says that his bride, Miss Cotton, of Bournemouth, whose labours in connection with Dr. Wilberforce's Mission have won for her great esteem, gave £5,000 to the restoration fund of St. Martin's Church.

Reviews and Notices.

"RICHARD WALDO SIETHORP, A BIOGRAPHY TOLD CHIEFLY IN HIS OWN CORRESPONDENCE." By the Rev. J. Fowler, Chaplain-Warden of St. Anne's Bede Houses, Lincoln. London: Skeffington and Son. 1880. Pp.

WE have just come across this most interesting book, the record of the career of a marvellous man, one possessed of great power, but lacking decision of character and clear insight into things, and the ability to distinguish between forms of error, and in what true churchmanship consists. Born at Canwick, near Lincoln, he spent some of the early years of his life under the parental roof, until he left for school at Eltham. During the time that he was at home, his father, although a sound Protestant, had in his house a Roman Catholic priest, a refugee, though it is said that he did not influence the young man in any way; whether this be really the case we cannot tell: certain it is that while an undergraduate at Oxford he ran away, and was ultimately found among Roman Catholics, but was brought back, and little more is said on the subject.

He was ordained by the then Bishop of Lincoln, and as a preacher was greatly sought after, being for some time curate at St. Mary's, Hull, under one of the Scotts, and after his removal to St. John's, Bedford Row, he made his mark as an earnest Evangelical preacher. Removing to St. James' Church, Ryde, he held a high position for some years, when he became unsettled, and ultimately left the Church of England for that of Rome. For some time after his reception he was popular as a preacher at St. Chad's Roman Cathedral in Birmingham, but it is evident that he had not thoroughly studied all the Roman doctrines, for he ultimately left that communion and came back to the Church of England, after which he built and endowed the St. Anne's Bede Houses in Lincoln, and yet even here he does not condemn the errors of the Church of Rome, and with much discontent at the apathy of the Church of England, which was then in a very lethargic state, he reverts to the Church of Rome, and is received back again, and says his first mass, after this his last return, in the house of Cardinal Wiseman, who was then near his end. But how vacillating, how weak! driven hither and thither, seeking rest and finding none. Strange commentary on the theological teaching of the day, for we cannot but think that had he studied the teaching of the Church he would have seen and known what the errors of Rome were, and wherein the Church of England differs from her.

Yet there was little of the Romanist in him, and his constant use of Scripture, and his actions, show that he was not the ardent devotee that some would have imagined him to be. He seems to have lived in the atmosphere of prayer, with a devout contemplation of Christ without those accessories which are generally associated with Rome. In one place we read of his saying, "I only want to get to Jesus." He gave away copies of the Scriptures, although they were of the Douay version, for he says, "I endeavour to bring those Catholics, to whose sick beds I minister, to make use of Scripture; alas! it is very uncommon;" and, he further remarks on the ignorance of many of the poor about the Scriptures. One remark which he makes with reference to the Redemptionist Fathers may be interesting, especially with reference to

Mission and Evangelistic work. "They (that is the masses) must be ferreted out and won to think of God and His goodness, and Death, and Heaven, and Hell, by services and teaching, adapted to their ignorance and need of external application to their senses." With regard to the use of hymns he says: "I find hymns very useful to me spiritually; Keble's Christian Year suggestive of precious thoughts; nor less so Wesley's, and St. Bernard's beautiful hymn, 'Jesus, the very thought of Thee.'"

It is refreshing to notice in his later years his liberality of sentiment; he often refers to the excellent work of Mr. S. Cox, the editor of the *Expositor*. Here also we find a very suggestive letter written from Whitby to his life-long friend, Dr. Bloxam. "I had hoped for quiet and mental repose; I found it only to be had in God, in humble, trustful confidence in Him, who doeth according to His will in heaven. Whatever brings us on our knees to Him is a real mercy; whatever makes us go under the shadow of His wing and cherish union with Him cannot but be a blessing. It is on this account I so much value the writings of Baldwin Brown. They are in my poor experience helps to this in the beautiful view they give us of God as our Father in Christ. I am not at all ashamed or afraid to get good from Dissenters." We quote from a letter addressed to the Rev. J. Fowler, another testimony to his liberality of sentiment: "I hope your Mission will be made a blessing to the inhabitants of Lincoln, and stir some of them to seek to 'lay hold on eternal life.' If this is the result I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice, whether the Mission is under the auspices of Cardinal Manning or a local Methodist preacher." And in another place he says: "I can truly say that a Wesleyan or Baptist or Independent who loves Christ in his heart and life is as dear to me as a Roman Cardinal or an Anglican Bishop."

But while acknowledging the see of Rome as his spiritual mother and being one of her priests, he was no Ultramontane in any sense, and did not care for many of the things of modern Rome. For instance, with reference to the famous Lourdes pilgrimage he says, "Also I may say that I don't like the Lourdes pilgrimage; it seems to me genuine superstition grounded on no sufficient warrant." With such sentiments one cannot but wonder how he could stay in the Church of Rome. He repeatedly confesses towards the end of his life that he loves the Church of England, we call the following, "I don't like the universities of our land to be separated from the Church of England." Again, "The Nonconformists—ignoring the better principles of a past generation, of John Wesley, the great Robert Hall, the Claytons, and others—are madly intent on pulling down the Established Church of England. I never was one of those who, leaving the Church of England, thought it right to decry her, nor can I. I admire her for the mass of truth that is in her, while I sensibly feel her disqualification, and I believe her downfall would involve that of this great country." One of his last acts was to write to his friends and also to send a message to Bishop Wordsworth to say how much he regretted Dr. Newman's step in accepting the Cardinal's hat.

He was visited during his last illness by Canon Forster of York, and he died as we are told, fortified with the rites of the Roman Church, and yet, strange to say, his request was that he should be buried in the cemetery of Lincoln, and that the English Burial Office should be used, which was done, and we are

told that before his death he read much of the Church of England Burial Service. His life was singularly pure and devout, and had he only had that ballast which a true churchman should have, and eschewed the errors of Rome, he would have been a burning and shining light in our own Church. The book is well worth reading, for there the reader can see for himself what the life really was.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Adkin, Rev. H. K., Curate of St. John's, Cheltenham; Vicar of Salperton.
 Baker, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of Thornham Magna with Thornham Parva, Suffolk.
 Barker, Rev. J. R., Vicar of All Saint's with St. Lawrence, Evesham; Vicar of St. John's, Ashley Green.
 Bishop, Rev. Everett, B.A., Rector of Cley-next-the-Sea, Norfolk.
 Bowen, Rev. Thomas James, B.A., Vicar of Kilvey, Swansea; Rector of Llangatock.
 Buckland, Rev. Augustus Robert, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon.
 Buttanshaw, Rev. George, M.A., Minister of the new church of St. Peter, Allerton.
 Cuthbert, Rev. George S., Vicar of Drayton-in-Hales, Market Drayton; Sub-Warden of the House of Mercy at Clewer, near Windsor.
 Emmet, Rev. William E., Vicar of West Drayton, near Uxbridge; Vicar of St. Mark's, Notting Hill.
 Evans, Rev. John, B.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.
 Exell, Rev. Joseph S., Vicar of Townstal, and Curate of St. Saviour's, Dartmouth, Devon.
 Fellowes, Rev. John Adolphus Liddell, Rector of Beighton, Norfolk.
 Gott, Rev. John, D.D., Vicar of Leeds; Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.
 Heygate, Rev. W. E., Vicar of Leigh, Sherborne.
 Jones, Rev. Ebenezer, Curate of St. Peter's, Carmarthen; Rector of Llangullo, Cardiganshire.
 Lloyd, Rev. Benjamin Marnor, Curate of Friday Bridge; Vicar of Witchford.
 Long, Rev. Ernest Henry Kellett, M.A., Rector of Swainthorpe with Newton Flotman, Norfolk.
 Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. Arthur Temple, M.A., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.
 Mee, Rev. John Riley, M.A., Rector of Town Barningham, Norfolk.
 Pickering, Rev. Robert, M.A., Curate of Dent, Vicar of Cowgill.
 Richardson, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Stretton-on-Dunsmore; Rural Dean of Baginton Deanery.
 Roper, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Smethwick; Rector of Tatenhill.
 Rowley, Rev. William Walter, M.A., Vicar of Woollavington.
 Rubie, Rev. George, B.A., Curate of Preston; Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's, Accrington.
 Rusby, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Curate of Hemingford Grey; Vicar of Friday Bridge.
 Smyth, Rev. Henry Metcalf, M.A., Chaplain of Sackford's Hospital, Woodbridge, Suffolk.
 Sutthery, Rev. William Stanley, M.A., Vicar-Designate of Lodsworth, Sussex; Chaplain to the Surrey County Asylum, Brookwood.
 Thomas, Rev. David W., Vicar of St. Ann's, Bethesda, Carnarvonshire; Rector of Penboyr, Cardigan.
 Vernon, Rev. William James, B.A., General Preacher, Diocese of Lincoln.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Bagot, Rev. Charles Walter, Rector of Castle-Rising and Roydon, and Chancellor of the Diocese of Bath and Wells, fourth son of the Hon. Richard, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Lady H. Bagot, on the 10th inst.
 Mitton, Rev. Welbury, for thirty-three years Vicar of St. Paul's, Manningham, Bradford, and Honorary Canon of Ripon, at Manningham, on the 12th inst., aged 79.



The Church of England Pulpit.

A RELIGION WHICH DEVELOPS THE FIT AND THE USEFUL.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. JAMES THE LESS, WESTMINSTER, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 3RD, 1884.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR H. POWELL, M.A.,
CURATE OF ST. JAMES THE LESS, WESTMINSTER.

"To sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared."—ST. MARK x. 40.

THIS text, a very well-known one, has often puzzled many people. The statement that the favour of precedence in Christ's kingdom was not Christ's to give has seemed to many to be a difficult statement. It seems hardly compatible with that other statement, "I and my Father are one," and, "The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son." It is in reality a difficulty only of translation and punctuation. The verse really runs thus: "To sit on my right and on my left hand is not mine to give, except to those for whom it is prepared."

The incident which gave rise to this remark of our Saviour's occurred as He and His disciples were on the way going up to Jerusalem. He had been telling His disciples of the sufferings which were to come upon Him; His betrayal, His cruel treatment, His final death. He was actually on the way up to suffer these things, and was trying to de-materialise the dull minds of those poor disciples, who were simply unable to grasp the thought of a suffering and persecuted Messiah. As they walked, He unfolded to them these things: with wondering senses they heard the strange revelation. It was, therefore, a very bad time for James and John, the sons of Zebedee, to come to their Master, clamouring for favours. It was just as if they wanted to make certain their own stake in the heavenly kingdom before Christ should be taken away from them; before, as they thought, all these evils should come upon Him, and perhaps take away His power of granting them any favours. These sons of Zebedee had been in a better social position than most of their brethren, and it is possible that they may have thought this was a claim upon the Christ's greater consideration. At any rate, with a bold demand they came: "Grant to us that we may sit, one on Thy right hand, and the other on Thy left hand, in Thy glory." The attitude of these disciples seems to have been this: "O Master, we have served Thee well, we have been Thy personal attendants; canst Thou

not therefore give to us a specially favoured corner in the realms of Thy glory?" The Jewish idea of precedence was to sit at the right and left hand of the host, and this prominent position the two disciples craved. They, poor men, seemed to be possessed with the idea that rewards in heaven were like so many bonuses, which Christ would distribute among His own personal friends. They, as it were, wanted Christ to give them a passport to His kingdom. Visions of Christ ruling the world, seated on a throne in great glory, and of themselves next to Him, passed before the entranced eyes of James and John. Then Christ spoke to them, and lifted the veil for ever from their eyes. "Can you," said He, "drink of the Cup that I drink of? or be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" They replied that they could. "Yea, indeed," replied our Saviour, "verily ye, James and John, shall indeed, in a way far different from that which you suppose, drink of My Cup—My Cup, not of triumph, but of suffering. But even then, this precedence which you ask for is not a matter of favour, but of fitness, and it is only mine to give to those who are qualified for it and worthy of it." And then arose quite a storm of jealousy among the band of disciples about this attempt of the sons of Zebedee to secure good things for themselves. They began to be much displeased with James and John. What a perfect glimpse of naturalness this is! How exactly these disciples behaved then as we should behave now! And then with what perfect love and wisdom the Christ points out to them their fundamental error, which was really wanting to occupy a high post without the necessary qualifications for it. "O my foolish disciples," said He, "how mistaken are your notions! This idea of yours, of exercising lordship over people, is a very mean one: ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you. No, whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief, shall be servant of all." And then He reminded them how that He, their King, and the Eternal Son of God, yet showed His supremacy in that Divinest way, by giving His life a ransom for many. This was Christ's eternal principle, "*the truest supremacy is the most faithful service to men.*"

The view of Christianity, the strangely twisted doctrine, which looks upon religion as an excellent way of "getting something," is, we trust, fast dying out. It has prevailed for a great many years, and its roots have struck very deeply down into our human soil, because, I think, that we, like James and John, have not properly conceived Christ's spirit of Christianity. Is not this a very familiar way of putting the question: "How can I get my soul saved? By what plan can I secure a reversion in heaven? How can I grasp the glories

of God's kingdom?" These are questions not of the highest pitch of nobility, and yet I think they would almost sum up many a man's creed. This opinion is not the fault of the laity, it is the fault of the clergy. For years and generations this was the song which was being dinned into the ears of Christendom: "Be very careful to look after your future interests; make your place in heaven as comfortable and secure as you can." Oh, how opposite this is to what Christ taught! "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me." And so if our aim is "getting"—either "getting" in the future life, or "getting" in the present life—then we cannot have grasped the teaching of Him who gave His life a ransom for many. It is very instructive to notice how Christ met this attempt at "getting" the favours of heaven. He at once shifted the whole question on to higher ground, removing it from the sordid area of grasping, to the nobler arena of enduring and doing. "Ye know not what ye ask. Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of?" He in effect teaches them, it is not a question of "how many blessings can I procure for myself?" but, "how much can I give out from myself?"

Your daily experience and mine proves abundantly the absolute truth of this doctrine of Christ's. There is a natural, and an almost universal desire in every man's heart, for power. Now the most irresistible and altogether unconquerable power in the whole world is the power of unselfishness. The desire *to get* on the part of the one, inspires the desire *to withhold* on the part of the other. The desire *to give out*, on the part of the one compels also the corresponding wish *to give out* on the part of the other. Herein lies the secret of the Christian's trust. "We love Him, because He first loved us." God has put forth all His eternal power and wisdom, and more than these, His eternal love for us, and consequently when we can once realise this fact, our essence must also go forth in one bound to Him:—God gave Himself for the advantage of man, to man; and when man knows this, he cannot help in turn giving Himself to God.

This thought-vein brings before us a statement which appears to be paradoxical. It is this: Can there really be, in the true sense of the word, any such thing as self-sacrifice? For self-sacrifice is, in reality, self-gain. To yield indefinitely, to give out infinitely is, as a matter of fact, to possess infinitely also. You will find from the records of history that human characters who have most largely swayed the masses have been those who possessed, or were supposed to possess, unselfishness. The self-renunciation of John the Baptist, the exaggerated self-affliction of Simeon Stylites, the poverty of the earlier friars of England, gave to all these enormous individual power. Giving up certain things which others did not give up, called

forth from the million the wish to give out willingly in their turn their trust and approbation. It is literally, "having nothing, and yet possessing all things."

But the two disciples, what of them? They proved to be, although they little expected it, perfect types of that of which our Lord was speaking. They both, in different ways, "gave out" for their Master. James yielded up his life for Christ—he was the first Apostle to receive the crown of martyrdom—slain by Herod with the sword. John's martyrdom was of a different nature. Instead of the martyrdom of death, it was the far harder martyrdom of living. His was the martyrdom of bereavement, first of James his brother, and then of all the Apostles:—of exile, of opposition, of persecution, of a hard life. He was the last of the Apostles to die, and although he died a natural death, he realised, I doubt not, before that time came, the never-ceasing martyrdom of life, when it is striving to be faithful unto death. Yes, James and John, in after days must have felt and realised what we must consider, when longings for Heaven's glories possess us, as they did them: we must not say, "God, let me sit at Thy right hand," but rather, "Can I drink of the cup which He drank of?" The glory is there, the supremacy is there, but—it cannot be clutched: *Canst thou drink of the cup which Christ drank of?*

Another marvellously divine and helpful thought which our Saviour brought out at the conclusion of this conversation, is the divineness of a life of service, of serving. "Whosoever," said He, "of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." How good it would be for us if we could act up to this principle! The natural idea of the untutored mind is that a man in supreme power would rule, and pull the strings that move the world, and please himself. In very ignorant nations the idea was a fact. The king was a self-pleasing chief. But as nations develop, how utterly and entirely this notion gives way. The leaders and rulers of modern nations are not those who "get" from the nation, but those who "give" to the nation. Our greatest public men are those who are most useful. Our rulers, in fact, *are our best servants*. Servitude, and qualifications for serving, are coming to be the badge of governing. There was probably never a time in the history of England when the people placed greater reliance in her public men. And this verily seems to be a strange dawning of Christ's teaching upon the world, that those who would be chief of all must be servants of all. Positions and honour are obtained now, and every day will tend more and more to be obtained, by service. If I may say so, Christ dealt the death-blow to "interest" when He rebuked James and John. He said, "No, the qualification must be, 'Canst thou drink

of the cup which I drink of?" And steadily and surely society is admitting the truth of the same principle. We are striving after the end,—striving with many throes, and not a little social and national friction,—but still, I trust, successfully striving—that those men who are the usefulest and helpfulest must guide us and rule us; or, in Christ's own words, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister." Even verbally Christ's words are fulfilled, when we read, day after day, of the plans and doings of the Queen's "Ministers."

What a world of thought we suddenly reach, when we strike the flint of one text with the steel of another text, and a divine spark is emitted, which lights up our system with the Christ-like principle of the divinity of eternal usefulness! Is it not a part of that stupendous truth, that nothing can live eternally except that which is useful and good? All nature is teaching us this lesson; plants, and animals, and men, and nations are disappearing and dying out unless they can give a favourable answer to the searching question, "Art thou useful? Art thou of any service to God or to man?" What a magnificent view this gives of man's magnificent share in the universe! The worlds are hastening along in their prescribed courses,—suns are forming—spheres are whirling in ordered procession through space: in what we call the chaos of nature there is no chaos: seas, and continents, and air, and clouds, are daily growing up and evolving; every star, every leaf, every creature that lives is busy, and is helping to roll the Great Universe along,—and nature, if asked, "Art thou useful?" must reply, "Yea, every grain and every molecule, every breath and every atom, all are contributing to the order and the usefulness of God's system! What is nature? Nature is an aggregation and a development of the eternally fit and useful. So also man's test must be this test of fitness too, and we may even go farther, and declare our belief that prospective material rewards are sometimes misleading in the way they are usually interpreted. Man's highest reward must be perfect co-operation with, union with, and knowledge of the Eternal God. When God's purposes become man's purposes, God's aims man's aims, God's spirit and essence man's spirit and essence; then we shall not find men clamouring for seats upon golden thrones, but we shall hear them ask, "How can I combine with God to further the purposes of man and of God?" for both these are identical. Or, to use our Saviour's phrase, we shall hear men ask, "How can I drink of the Cup which Christ drank of?"

The eternally useful need not, of course, be the eternally assertive or prominent. Many careers of usefulness there are, which are perhaps more of enduring than of acting. To endure, in many circumstances, is, in a sense, to act.

"Who best
Bear His mild yoke, they serve Him best."

But remember, O man, you, in your little niche of life, are being called to by God and by all nature, and are being asked, "*Art thou useful?*" O consecrate to God's end, not to ambition's end, the talent which is yours, and thus you may be one with God, a worker with God. The Eternal says, "I ask, my son, that to Me thou wilt dedicate thy talent; bury it not, nor hide it! The Eternal will demand His own, and will ask you for

"That one talent which is death to hide."

There remains yet the line, "It shall be given to those for whom it is prepared." I think the most natural words that man would have put here instead of what are written would be, "It shall be granted to those who have duly earned it." But not so, "it shall be given." Here let us reflect for a moment. To earn a reward implies no favour on the part of Him who bestows it. The labourer is worthy of his hire. It is his due, and he can claim it as a right—it is no gift at all. But can we thus claim the rewards of heaven? Assuredly not, for we have not qualified for them. There remains the awful barrier—"Can ye drink of the cup which I drink of?" This again brings us to another paradox, for we find only the eternally useful and good can enter heaven, and also we find that no man can be eternally useful and good, no man can drink of the cup. All through Scripture we invariably meet with this paradox. We find that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap;" we find that consequence follows action; we find that God will reward every man according as his work shall be. And yet we see that "it shall be given to those for whom it is prepared." How can we reconcile the two lines of argument? Only in one way, and that is just what saves our religion from being a fatalism, or a mere plan of salvation: it deposes blind law, and puts a living Judge in its place; it gives equity a share in the decrees of the Court. Only by being eternally fit and useful can we enter heaven, and please God; God only can make us eternally fit and useful. This is the deep mystery of Christianity. *God only can help us to approach God*: so Christianity is not eternal fitness and eternal usefulness, it is *God in Christ*.

Let us thank God for the *humanity* of Christianity! How we all shrink from dead law! How we are impelled to cling to the living Christ! Law repels us, for it proclaims our guilt; love attracts us, for it announces our forgiveness. Law is a machine, working senselessly on; the Man Christ, the God Christ, was tempted in all points like as we are, He knew the martyrdom of daily life. And thus, where the system must fail, the personal element rescues, and so the sated philosopher, and the weary student, and the humble Christian, and the little child, come back at last, as you and

I must, to that "gentle Jesus, meek and mild," to the old simple story of a Saviour's love, to the story of the Cross, to the story of how He could not see us perishing, but came down in pity to save us. O yes, it shall be given to those for whom it is prepared! Then, are you prepared? You reply, in solemn and pathetic tones, "Can I drink of the cup which Christ drank of?" *Can you?* Without the faintest echo of a doubt, say yes! "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

JACOB'S LADDER.

BY THE REV. COURTENAY MOORE, M.A.,
RECTOR OF MITCHELSTOWN, IRELAND.

SERMON PREACHED AT MALLOW.

"And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it."—GENESIS xxviii. 12, 13.

THE beautiful incident in the life of Jacob described in the text has an additional interest for us because of some words spoken with reference to it by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see Heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."

Reading Jacob's dream in the light thrown on it by these words, the lesson it teaches us Christians is that the ladder set up on earth, the top of which reached to heaven, is the Word made flesh. Jesus, being God and Man, connects the two worlds, He is the ladder between them. "In the great truth of His incarnation heaven was and has remained opened. From that time onward messengers were ever going backward and forward between humanity and God. The cry of every erring and helpless child to its Eternal Father for guidance and strength, the silent appeal of the wronged and down-trodden to the all-just Avenger, the fears and hopes of the soul burdened by the intolerable weight of sin, and casting itself on the mercy of the eternal love—all these are borne by messengers who always behold the face of God. And every light that falls upon the path, and every strength that nerves the moral frame; every comfort to the heart smarting beneath its wrong; every sense of forgiveness, atonement, peace—all these like angels descend that ladder, coming from heaven to earth. Ascending precedes descending as in the vision of old. Heaven's messengers are ever ready when earth's will bid them come. The revelation of the fullest truth of God is never wanting to the heart that is open to receive it. The ladder is set up on the earth, but it reaches to heaven, and the Lord stands above it. It goes down to the very depths of man's weakness, wretchedness, and sin, and he may lay hold of it

and step by step ascend it. In the Incarnation; Deity took human form on earth; in the Ascension, Humanity was raised to Heaven."

This, then, is the great and beautiful lesson to us Christians of the dream of Jacob. There are two worlds, the seen and the unseen, the temporal and the eternal. Jesus Christ is the ladder reaching from the lower to the higher. He touches both worlds, because He is both God and Man. Through Him our prayers go up, and through Him the answers come down. Resting on Him, and following the blessed steps of His most holy life, those who know and love Him, gradually are formed after His image and likeness; they ascend the ladder of spiritual life until they finally are with Him where He is when He sees fit to call them to enter into the rest that remaineth for the people of God.

It is remarkable how readily many portions of Holy Scripture yield themselves to the giving out of practical lessons, and the text is a case in point; so having drawn from it its main lesson, we may go on to consider another which it may teach us, though not so directly. Let us take the ladder as an emblem or figure of human life. It had two ends, one resting on earth, the other reaching to heaven, but it was only one ladder; and so also every complete life has two ends, one resting on earth, and the other on eternity, but it is only one life. There is often a temptation to us to think only of the lower end of the ladder which is resting on the things seen and temporal, and to make most of it; speaking, thinking of what is above and out of sight as resting on something very unsubstantial and uncertain, perhaps on nothing at all, and that therefore it is better to sit still by the earthly resting-place, and make the most and the best of it. Every one has felt this temptation in some of its forms; but if this be so it is no less true that there are experiences in our lives when a great need arises for us to feel that the ladder of our life has some resting-place above as well as below. Some have more acquaintance with sorrow and suffering than others; but if the ladder of human life does not touch any world but this, if when shifted from its lower resting-place all is over, what key have we to unlock the terrible mysteries of sin, suffering, sorrow, bereavement, and poverty, which we continually see around us. Thank God, His holy Word here gives us no uncertain sound. The things unseen against which the farther end of the ladder leans, though now unseen, are eternal.

This, then, is another application of Jacob's dream. Just as his ladder reached from earth to heaven, so every spiritual life does the same. It has an end here on earth, for every Christian has his duties here, his work here, his various opportunities, responsibilities, and blessings here, all of which, if rightly accepted and discharged, will go to the formation of a character that will be completed

and perfected hereafter in that other world on which even now it rests, but which it shall then have fully entered. And so considered, Jacob's ladder teaches us the great truth of the continuity of life in and through death; that there will be no great break or revolution in it, so to speak, but rather a growth and maturity according to the law described by St. Paul, that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

There is another feature of the dream that has also its practical lessons. As every ladder has two ends, so also it has between these, rounds or steps, by which it is ascended or descended. It is a common form of expression to say of a successful man that he has gained another step in the ladder, or that he has got to the top of the ladder, meaning that he has risen high in his profession or sphere, or as high as is possible. And viewing the matter with regard to our spiritual life, it is also an ascent from small and weak beginnings. We must, says our Lord, be converted and become as little children, we must begin in humility and weakness at the lowest round. We must, either sooner or later, if we would be saved, consciously cling to our Lord and Saviour, beseeching Him to raise us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. And treating the simile from this point of view, the ascent of the ladder would represent our growth in grace and knowledge, the gradual formation and building up of our spiritual life. And the more this growth increases, the more shall we be furnished with an answer to the form of temptation already noticed, which is common to so many, viz., this: some one may say, "You speak of your life as a ladder touching two worlds, with one end resting here, and the further end in the world above; but how am I to know that there is either any further end to this ladder of life, or any other world for it to rest on?" My brethren, to answer this question fully would require much more time than is now at our disposal, but confining ourselves to the subject now in hand, I would say, we are not careful, *i.e.*, anxious or troubled about the answer to this matter. For I do not believe that any one who has made any real ascent of this ladder of life, which we assert touches the two worlds, can have any continued doubt of the reality of the unseen world which it touches. Such an one has already entered that world in one sense, and already lives in it. He has what St. Paul calls the earnest of his inheritance, he knows something of what is meant by joy and peace in believing. He has practical personal experience of the benefit and blessing of religion; he has the witness in himself, and he sees it in others.

"Und was die innere Stimme spricht,
Das täuscht die hoffende Seele nicht."

The teaching of the dream of Jacob shows this, for the angels were going up and down the ladder; there was present and continual communication

between the two worlds. Heaven is by no means entirely a thing of the future; the kingdom of God may be even now within us, we can taste the good word of God and the power of the world to come. No humble, earnest Christian, therefore, who is growing in the spiritual life, who is ascending the rounds of the ladder, can doubt the reality of the ascent he is making. He may not yet see the farther end of the ladder, he does not know how near or how distant it may be; but he is convinced of its reality, and that it rests on eternity. And this hope he has as an anchor of the soul both sure and stedfast.

But resuming the consideration of the lesson taught us by the rounds of the ladder as suggestive of a gradual ascent, we may also do well to remember that the rate of our progress depends to some considerable extent on ourselves. We read in the Bible of the last being first. St. Paul was a striking example of that: First a persecutor, then in labours more abundant than they all, pressing forward towards the mark, swiftly ascending the ladder, like the leader of a storming party: "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Later on such an one as St. Augustine, until middle life a stranger to the yoke of Christ and the power of His grace, then, his heart suddenly touched by a passage of the Word of God, which is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, he is brought to his knees a penitent sinner; he places his foot on the lowest round of the ladder, and by Divine grace how steadily and swiftly he ascends, forgetting the things that were behind. And his own words have been versified in the familiar lines, which express a great truth:—

"I hold it truth with him who sings
To one clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."

And now, briefly gathering up what we have tried to learn from Jacob's dream of the Ladder, we see that, read in the light of our Lord's reference to it, it is the Lord Jesus Himself. He is the Ladder connecting heaven and earth. We must climb to heaven by Him. No matter how low we may be sunk and fallen, this Ladder will be within our reach, if only we will have it so; by it we may ascend from the pit and miry clay of sin to a new life of purity and blessing. May He plant our feet firmly upon it and order our going. Then, through Christ, the Ladder, prayers for help are always going up, and aid in answer is coming down. Therefore heaven is not all a thing of the future, there is a present sense of its reality and blessedness.

Next we saw that Jacob's Ladder was an emblem of man's life. The ladder had two ends, one on earth and one in heaven, and so has every true Christian life; it touches both time and eternity, it rests both on earth and heaven. What a won-

derful and glorious thought, conveying to us the earnest of the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for those who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

Lastly we learned that the rounds of the Ladder suggested to us the progressive nature of the Christian life. It is doubtless much more ardent with some than with others, but there must be progress with all, there is no sitting still or standing still in the ascent. Though faint we must be pursuing.

Let us then each ask himself, as bringing home these teachings to our souls, "Do I regard the Lord Jesus as the Ladder between heaven and earth, by which only I can ascend into the hill of the Lord, and stand in His holy place? Do I realise the great fact that my life rests upon and touches two worlds, the temporal and the eternal, and am I humbly conscious of any growth in grace as a test that I am really ascending the ladder, since progress is a necessary test of spiritual life, for the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1884.

THE ATTACK ON THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE social influence of the nobility so pervades English society, that it is difficult for any one to write about that order without falling into one of two opposite forms of snobbishness—that of courtship and flattery, as practised by a very numerous class who hold an equivocal and insecure position on the outskirts of high society, and the still coarser form of vulgar denunciation and abuse, of which Mr. Thorold Rogers and Mr. Bradlaugh are examples, and to which Mr. Gladstone himself, as a conscious and not perfectly satisfied *parvenu*, is by no means a stranger. Yet there exist on English soil, retirements, local and mental, so profound, that their happy inmates can think and write about my Lords Spiritual and Temporal, with as complete absence of all personal considerations, as if they were discussing the patri- cians of ancient Rome, or the leaders of society

in a satellite of Jupiter. There is some merit in calmness in the present stormy state of the political world. Yet all that tempest is perfectly artificial, and the work of one man. As we predicted, Mr. Gladstone, dissatisfied with the progress of the agitation which he had originated, soon took the bellows himself, appeared again in Scotland as in 1879, followed by a pack of titled and untitled jackals, and has been engaged for three weeks in persistent self-exhibition, haranguing at railway stations, shaking hands, and even kissing babies (as candidates did in older days at the classic election for the borough of Eatonswill), protesting with every canful of petroleum that he threw upon the flames, that it was all spontaneous combustion, of which he himself must not be considered the incendiary. At Edinburgh he held what his United Presbyterian supporters would call three *diets* of worship, in which the sole object of adoration was himself. In that short time, he probably swallowed the greatest amount of flattery ever consumed by one single man, and spent the greatest number of hours in praising himself, without, during the whole process, ever showing the smallest symptom of nausea, but retaining to the end an appetite both for flattery and for self-praise, which only grew with indulgence, and appeared practically inexhaustible. The result of his efforts has been to increase, at least in Scotland, the violence and the area of agitation, and to show unequivocally that the revolutionary movement which he, the Prime Minister, has evoked, menaces not only the aristocracy but also the Crown. At the Trades' Union Congress at Aberdeen, after the usual votes of admiration to Mr. Gladstone, the following resolution was passed with only one dissident: "That this Congress is of opinion that the time has arrived when the hereditary principle should be removed from our Constitution, and calls upon the Government to bring in, as soon as possible after the passing of the Franchise Bill, a measure dealing in a vigorous and comprehensive manner, with this important subject." The seconder of the resolution took occasion to point out "that if they abolished the hereditary principle, they would have to elect their monarchs or presidents, or whatever they pleased to call them." Probably the Grand Old Man would have no objection to be Monarch, or President, or whatever the proletarians, whose hands he shakes, and whose babies he kisses, might be pleased to call him. If we enquire into the cause of this factitious agitation, we find that only one accusation yet continues to be alleged against the House of Lords; that they have assumed the right to dictate to the Government when Parliament should be dissolved. They have laid claim to no such authority. If, by the exercise of their undoubted rights, they succeed in reducing the Government of the day to the necessity of appealing to the constituencies, they will have, according to all the rules of fair play, a right to the advantage

that has accrued to them from their judicious strategy. And the existence of a power in the State, capable of provoking such appeal, is considered by many Radicals, as by Mr. Henry Labouchere, a most salutary institution. The extension of the Franchise is, as every one admits, a change which, whether for good or evil, is now inevitable. Whether it takes place a year sooner or a year later may be of great importance to Mr. Gladstone's personal career, and to the fortunes of the Liberal party; but to the nation it is perfectly immaterial. And, therefore, the action of the man who has excited all this turmoil, who has armed class against class, and by dividing the nation has weakened it in presence of its rivals and enemies, having no objects but those of the individual or of the party, is nothing less than a selfish crime. Whether it has been Mr. Gladstone's distinct intention to direct the agitation against the Peerage and the Crown, is a question on which we would not venture an opinion. Probably he is too absorbed in self-admiration, and intoxicated with flattery to know exactly what he himself meant. Certain it is, that the question of the House of Lords is now exciting far more interest than that of the Franchise: and it is on that that we desire to say a few words to-day. We have already pointed out the weak points which detract from its influence as a second chamber—the absence from it of the representative element, and the presence in it of a great number of members who neglect entirely their important functions, and of a few black sheep, who have disgraced historic titles by appearances in the Divorce Court and other disreputable scenes. It is not an institution of ideal perfection. No Abbé Sièyes ever drew up on paper or carried in his pocket a project of such an assembly. It exists, like all other English institutions, because the events of history have brought it into being, and the nation has grown up under its shadow, and for no other reason. But, being where it is, it has done good service. To the advance of Democracy, being a stage in the development of nations, which may be hastened or retarded, but cannot be prevented, by the statesman's skill, and which is most beneficial, or least injurious, when it is slow and gradual, the House of Lords has ever supplied the *vis inertiae*, which has impeded too rapid changes. It has caused the development of the English nation to be a continuous thing, not vibrating, as is the case with our neighbours the French, from Democracy to Despotism, and then again from Despotism to Democracy, but holding fast every advance as an irreversible conquest. It embodies that Conservative force, which even the extremest Liberal would hardly deny to be a potent element in the national strength. It affords a splendid opportunity for decorating and rewarding merit: and it contains a greater amount of practical ability, and discharges its functions with greater dignity

and more finished courtesy, than any other assembly in the world. An institution like this is not to be coerced and intimidated because it has crossed the ambition and wounded the vanity of a selfish and unscrupulous politician. Such as it is, it should be maintained in the free exercise of its constitutional functions, and treated with that respect, with which it itself behaves to the co-ordinate estates of the realm. When calmer times return, its weaknesses should be, as they may be, reinforced, until it becomes a body representative of the best wisdom of the nation, and, as such, like the Senate of the United States, not inferior, and perhaps superior, in influence, to the more popular and directly representative assembly. Thus strengthened, it might become a body which no agitator dare attack. Even as it is, it is most valuable as the sole obstacle yet remaining to the rule of demagogues—the most odious and tyrannical of all despotisms. As such, it seems to us to be the duty of every good citizen to assert and defend it, while so violently attacked. There is much in the present crisis which inspires us with great anxiety. When a man so able as Mr. Gladstone has finally parted with his last scruples of conscience, and is striving more equivocally, day by day, to enlist the lower and less educated classes as his own personal allies against his rivals in the State: and, in order to secure their support, spares no flattery however fulsome, and is ready to abandon every constitutional safeguard which checks the impulses of popular favour or dislike, the leaders on the other side have a difficult part to play, in which they cannot receive too much encouragement and support. We trust they may be able to oppose argument to declamation, temperance to violence, self-effacement to exuberant vanity, defence of menaced institutions to the assertion of personal self-will. If they take and keep this line, we believe that there are still before them good hopes of success, Englishmen like fair-play, admire courage, and are accessible to reason. Even working men are able to see that there are other things for a nation to consider besides working-class interests; and that those who treat their interests as the only things to be considered are flatterers, who have objects of their own. The political outlook is perhaps better than it seems. *Veritatem laborare nimis sæpe, aiunt, extinguere nunquam.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—On comparing "*Erigena's*" letter of last week with Dr. Wace's tract on "The Authenticity of the Four Gospels" ("Present Day Tracts," Vol. III.) we cannot fail to see that the efforts of controversialists

to establish an early date for the Synoptic Gospels find their starting-point in the Acts of the Apostles. The "we" sections as they are called from the transition of the narrative from the third to the first person form but an inconsiderable portion of the book, viz., two whole chapters and portions of three others. They are, however, assumed to be from the pen of St. Luke, who exhibits in them, so it is said, the same medical phraseology, which Dr. Hobart claims for the whole book of Acts. The whole book is therefore the work of the same author. But St. Luke's Gospel is confessedly from the same pen. Hence the early date of the third Gospel is a simple Q. E. D. taking naturally the other two Synoptical Gospels along with it. This is what may be called the strongest line of defence on that side of the question. If conclusive, the result will be that the third and, *à fortiori*, the two earlier Gospels were written within the lifetime of a companion of St. Paul.

Now, in all historical inquiries which by their very nature are removed from the possibility of verification, it is our duty as reasonable men to exercise our critical faculties, and to test such statements as the above in the balance of probabilities. I observe, then, that the name of the author of the "we" sections does not appear in the text. There is no such a thing as "I, Luke" corresponding to the "I, John" of the Apocalypse. The author is self-effaced. His language in these sections is not more distinctly medical than that of any fairly educated man, and his actions are, as I have shown in a previous letter, decidedly unprofessional.

Through your courtesy, Sir, I have before me a copy of Dr. Hobart's work referred to, "The Medical Language of St. Luke," which I am studying. The argument appears to me greatly overstrained. All possible words, even those most innocent of any medical meaning, are dragged in to swell the volume of apparent testimony. St. Luke cannot say in the introduction to the third Gospel that "many have taken in hand to set forth, etc.," without having five words fastened upon and their "medical tinge" pointed out. Five words in one single sentence! How saturated with medical phraseology St. Luke's head must have been that he could not apparently express himself unprofessionally in a matter which did not concern his reputed science. It reminds me of a dress-maker in one of Miss Edgeworth's tales, who was so skilful in her craft, and so much in request, that her admirers asserted that she ate, drank, and slept with her mouth full of pins! Let it not be supposed, however, that St. Luke was poring constantly over those voluminous medical works which have engrossed Dr. Hobart. Galen's twenty-one volumes were not written in his time, nor the works of Aretæus and of Dioscorides. So far from being convinced that St. Luke's phraseology proves his medical training, the wonder would have been great indeed if an Asiatic Greek, like the author of the third Gospel, rendering the Gospel tradition into purer Greek, had not used a number of words in common parlance in his day, and now found scattered up and down in the many-volumed medical works, with one exception, of a slightly later age. Dr. Hobart does not make any allowance for this, nor for the manifest fact that any intelligent Greek would inevitably use current medical terms without being necessarily a medical man. Thucydides used medical phraseology in describing the plague at Athens, was he therefore a physician? Not at all. I have been reading over again that account of

the plague in Vol. II. of the History of Thucydides, and comparing his phraseology with that of St. Luke, as savouring of medicine according to Dr. Hobart, and, in one single paragraph, the 49th, I find no less than nine words identical with those paraded by the Irish scholar, as derived by St. Luke from medical sources, besides a few others slightly varying in form. No; Dr. Hobart's book greatly wants weeding out. All words found in publications previous or contemporary to St. Luke not being medical works, should be expunged. Till this is done, no weight can be attached to the book. In its present form it is quite untrustworthy.

Returning, after this digression, to the "we" sections of the Acts of the Apostles, I may observe that not only such distinguished critics of a former generation, as Schleiermacher, De Wette and Bleek, assign them to another author than St. Luke, but that a number of able critics at the present day, have concluded that they were not composed by the author of the rest of the Acts. Dr. Davidson points out that the use of Jewish designations of time is against the supposed authorship of a Greek Christian. See Acts xx. 6 and xxvii. 9. I allow myself that Luke was possibly the author of these sections—not indeed in the form we have them now, but as brief notes or memoirs, such as those which probably form the basis of our present Synoptical Gospels. Whatever supposition is adopted regarding the authorship of these sections, it forms too precarious a basis for superstructure. Direct evidence, even in an historical sense, which is always relative, is absolutely wanting. Why it should be absent in so momentous a matter as the authorship of our sacred books is a mystery, inexplicable, except on the hypothesis of a later authorship than "*Erigena*" is willing to assign.

Nothing is easier than to imagine evidence of the simplest character, and yet of such a kind that, by comparison, the argument of Dr. Wace and "*Erigena*" is but of cobweb strength. Suppose St. Luke's name appeared in the "we" sections, like the "I, John" of the Apocalypse, or better still, if it appeared in the introduction of the two books assigned to him, would not their case be greatly strengthened? Had Luke attended Publius or any of his shipwrecked companions professionally, or better still, had one of the Apostles vouched for the authenticity and genuineness of his writings, how triumphant would Messrs. Wace and "*Erigena*" be! Luke was with Paul several years after their arrival at Rome; they must have been most intimate. "Only Luke is with me" (2 Tim. iv. 2), bespeaks close companionship after the time at which the book of Acts closes, which time, according to Dean Alford, was in the spring of A.D. 63. If Luke wrote that book at that date, why has his intimate friend and fellow-Christian no word of commendation for it? "But," says Dean Alford, "the Gospel of Luke had been some considerable time published." *A fortiori*, then, Paul was well conversant with that work, and yet in his pastoral Epistles he completely ignores it. A single little line of reference to one or the other of the works of his intimate companion from the pen of Paul would have altered for all time the tone of the whole controversy. Why do we not find any such direct reference? The answer is obvious. It could not be because the works were not worth noticing, but simply because they did not exist. St. Peter knew of Paul's Epistles, and referred to them, but Paul knew nothing of the supposed works of Luke, and therefore could make no mention of them.

But while Paul was naturally ignorant of Luke's writings, it would be strange indeed, after due consideration of the intimacy referred to, and the causes which brought them together at Rome, if we looked upon Luke as ignorant of Paul's Epistles. Of course it suits the argument of the "*Horæ Paulinæ*" to assume this ignorance, but "*Erigena*" must see, on reflection, that it is nothing more than an assumption. A man of Paul's strong religious convictions and persistent energy, would more probably be frequently going over, with his companion, the old ground and the old Epistles in which he had poured forth his whole soul. I cannot imagine a greater solace to Paul, aged and a prisoner. Reticence and silence would not be natural. What documents he had he would exhibit, probably more than once, and the documents nearest to his heart would be his own Epistles. I grant that this is also an assumption, but, of the two, it strikes me as more reasonable than the other.

I had intended, when I took up my pen, to set before your readers something more solid than the arguments I have been criticising. I must leave that for some future occasion. Meanwhile, foreseeing as I did from the first, that the argument is endless on the date of our Gospels, if any particular year or decade is sought to be fixed, I return to a wish already expressed that we should rather attempt to fix the dates between which, on any reasonable hypothesis, the books must have been written. Within those limits, anyone may be at liberty to show his preference for an earlier, or a later period, but they should be such that he could not overpass them without having the preponderance of argument against him.

F. T. P.

CHURCH AND STATE.

SIR,—Mr. Lawrence's very able and interesting articles on Saul and Samuel appear to me to contain an error of some importance, at least as regards the correct use of words. He speaks of Church and State as if these words were applicable to ancient Israel. This is not so. In the ancient world, Church and State were one. The words Church and State could not be translated into the language of the Old Testament:—"The congregation of the Children of Israel" was at once the Church and the State. It is true that the offices of Priest and King were distinct in Israel, and in many heathen countries, but they were both officers of the Commonwealth. A Church in the Christian sense was first founded by Christ.

I do not mean that this error vitiates Mr. Lawrence's statement of historical events, for a contest between kings and priests may in such a discussion be called a contest between Church and State without any essential misrepresentation.

M.

Belfast, 19th Sept., 1884.

HARVEST THANKSGIVINGS.

SIR,—Harvest Thanksgivings are so usual that they require no advocacy. You may remember, Sir, years back, when these began to assume more of the form they are doing now, that the folly of one man, who put "the boar's head" in a prominent spot in a Black Country church, led to a revulsion of feeling in this matter; just as the misguided enthusiasm of

many of the clergy is causing a revulsion of sentiment in some other directions; and not without reason.

At the time to which I allude, letters appeared on the questionable taste of "turning our churches into market gardens." This feeling still prevails amongst some of the clergy. May I remind them that the Levitical Law enjoined the presentation of the first fruits of the earth as a tribute of thankfulness for these gifts of God and an acknowledgment of Him as the Great Giver of all our blessings, temporal and spiritual.

We have just held our "Harvest Thanksgiving." There were no printed notices of the Service; notice was given, of course, on the Sunday previous; the invitation was given to send of "the fruits of the earth" to God's House, and that these acknowledgments of Divine goodness should be forwarded to our county hospital. The hymns for harvest from H. A. and M. were separately printed, and the Service was not choral or any attempt at it. If we had tried to depart thus from our usual practice in a village church, with long-standing dissent around us, the ear might have been pleased, but certainly there would not have been the union of voice from a very large congregation, and a hearty response in the Service. This end attained will carry weight with those who care more for a congregational offering of prayer and praise than a mere performance of a "hearty service" (?) in which the officiating clergyman and the choir reproduce the old "duet between Parson and Clerk." The Rev. Charles Trollope, of Stibbington, preached a sermon which will not soon be forgotten by myself or my people. I have only heard one preacher, Bishop Oxenden, deliver a written sermon in the same effective manner. A sermon which the fastidious could listen to with admiration, in which all could feel interest all the way through, not from wealth of imagery, but for the wealth of Scriptural quotation, and the new turns given to what was old. I allude to this, because the idea is prevalent that nothing will go down now except addresses of a more *impromptu* kind. There are many who have not the presence of mind and readiness for such preaching; but the younger clergy need not run into the notion that old men are all effete who keep to their MS. When the subject is thoroughly mastered, and instead of being coldly read, is delivered from a feeling heart to hearts and heads ready to feel and think aright, the effect desired may be hoped for. *Si vis me flere flebendum est tibi* is true as a direction to effective addresses, while we quote it in its spirit, not insisting on the letter. We have too little faith in the importance of our duty as preachers of a Divine Message, and the probability, with grace sought and pains taken, that "the Pulpit may be a Power" where we are not equal to a Liddon, a Magee, or an Alexander.

P.

CHURCH CONGRESSES.

SIR,—The Church Congress as an annual meeting has nearly attained its majority. Some of the ablest clergy and laity of the English Church, have done their best, by talent and valuable experience exhibited in sermons, papers, and speeches, to further its objects. It would be doing a wrong to its energetic permanent Secretary and permanent Committee, not to acknowledge with gratitude their successful endeavours to

keep abreast of the ecclesiastical, moral, social, and intellectual questions of the day; this is exemplified in the subjects chosen for the Carlisle Congress. It would be strange if care in the choice of subjects, and a practical turn were not shown in the diocese of which Harvey Goodwin is bishop. He cannot go up higher in office; but if the *congé d'élire* becomes a reality, he may hope for a more influential sphere than Carlisle; that is, if work at *alma mater* and subsequently at Ely and Carlisle, has any weight with English Churchmen. The anniversary of the foundation of our branch of the Church in America and the experiences of Scotch Episcopal and Irish Bishops, cannot fail to prove interesting to those who view the Church's history and progress historically and spiritually. In your last paper there is a valuable letter on the subject of our Book of Common Prayer. The American and Irish Bishops may tell of the bond of faith not being broken by the wise and timely revision of the Book of Common Prayer as now used in the American and Irish Church—for the "Irish Church" I still will consider it; remembering its antiquity, and purity of teaching, and earnestness in Missionary enterprise before Ireland was invaded by doctrines more corrupt, and the Irish Church ruthlessly dealt with by the present Premier. I hope the bishops of the American and Irish Church will do good service to England's Church, by noting some of the wise changes made by them in the Prayer Book, notably, I presume to think, in retaining the "Athanasian Creed," as an old Creed of the divided Church, and leaving its use optional to those who are members of those Churches. Of course I shall be set down as a "latitudinarian" in reverting to this. Let another speak whose testimony regarding the "Athanasian Creed" is not to be disowned. I am sorry I cannot give the page, but, in the latter half of "Reminiscences of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement," Vol. II., will be found the observations of its aged and talented author, in which he sums up his views in a valuable form on many topics. If we have another Church Congress next year, why should not the "Revision of the Prayer Book" be taken as one of its topics.

There seems to be a greater disposition to discuss "burning questions" at Church Congress. Let us hope that this desire to hear different sides, and to come to a better agreement as the result of hearing both sides, may prevail more and more. The better temper evinced at these meetings ought to be an encouragement to ventilate subjects stirring the minds of clergy and laity and debated by the outside world.

B. N.

PRIVATE AND FAMILY PRAYERS.

SIR,—Would you, or some of your readers, kindly name the most devotional volume of Prayers for Family and for private use, or both combined, which best fulfils the following *desiderata*:—Couched in language simple but chaste and spiritual; purely Evangelical in tone, and free from the disfigurement of bracketted sentences or remarks.

J. S.

[We think "The Pocket Prayer Book," compiled by Mrs. Wilkinson at the beginning of this century, and published by the Philanthropic Society, St. George's Fields, London, and "Family Prayers," prepared by a

Committee of the Upper House of Convocation and published by Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., would meet the requirements of J. S.—ED.)

Reviews and Notices.

THE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—"HOW IS THE DIVINITY OF JESUS DEPICTED IN THE GOSPELS AND EPISTLES?" By Rev. T. Whitelaw, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884. Pp. 272. "IS DOGMA A NECESSITY?" By the Rev. F. Meyrick, M.A. *Ibid.* Pp. 225.

NOTHING, perhaps, would be more unfair than to quarrel with two able and instructive books; one, because it is not something different to what it professes to be, and the other because of the incompleteness of its title. However we have not the slightest intention to quarrel with either of these books; on the contrary, of the first we say that its expressed intention—"primarily a handbook of New Testament Christology, and aiming at representing succinctly, yet with some degree of fulness, the doctrine of the Person of Christ contained in the Gospels and Epistles"—is carried out, not only with much learning, but also with much fairness, which is even better; and of the second that we give a hearty Amen to the wish wherewith the book closes:—"We may live to see a clergy some of whom may still enjoy the liberal education supplied by the University, while for all there may be provided systematic instruction in the doctrines of Christianity, and in the relation that those doctrines bear to one another. The result might be less dogmatism and more dogma."

But nevertheless, while it is not fair to criticise the first of our books for not being something different to what it professes to be; it nevertheless may be fair to ask, Is the mode Dr. Whitelaw has chosen, the best mode of carrying out the promise implied by the title, "Is Christ Divine?" which the advertisements of "The Theological Library" held out? Or, in other words, is an array of proofs, taken mainly from the teaching of the Apostles, the best way of proving the Divinity of Christ? We cannot think it is the best way, although it is the one generally adopted; first, because such a method almost necessarily degenerates into a proof-by-quotation-of-texts argument. Not long ago, we had in our hands a book by a Unitarian which positively bristled with texts. Of course the Unitarian proved his case that way,—of course every sect proves its case that way. Texts can prove everything and nothing. Secondly, because such a method of argument, however ably conducted—as it is in Dr. Whitelaw's volume—is always open to the objection that the stream can never rise higher than its source. Or, in other words, either Jesus Christ Himself, by the direct claim which His Life, Death, and Resurrection made, and through His Church still makes, on His followers, proves His Divinity, or else the writings of Apostles who never professed to be more than followers, cannot. Or yet again, in other words, Not so many texts,—which *we* say do, while the Unitarians say they do not—but the life of Jesus Himself, once personally lived on earth, and still acting by the Spirit in the Church, proves Him to be "the Christ, the Son of God" (S. John xx. 31). Or yet

once again in other words, Either Christ and Christendom are the proof, or else there is no proof.

For if we consider the evidence for the Divinity of Christ in a strict sense, the attempt to base the proof on the words of the Apostles rather than on the Life of Christ, is like an attempt to prove an unsigned and unattested document to be a will, by the evidence of persons who say that it was intended for such. It *may* have been, yet no judge would listen to their evidence for a moment. But, on the other hand, if the paper were duly signed and attested, and only because of some side issue were there doubts, then their evidence would be of the utmost value. So should the argument be conducted, we think, in all books on the Divinity of Christ. What Christ by His Life, Death, and Resurrection proved Himself to be, and by His teaching claimed to be, and also what by the power of His Spirit dwelling in the Church He still shows Himself to be, should ever be made the basis of the proof of His Divinity.

And a very curious piece of evidence in favour of such a mode of proof, has been given us during the last few months in the interesting quadrilateral duel (as the *Saturday Review* called it) between Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Mr. Wilfred Ward, and Sir James Stephen. The meekness of Mr. Harrison's reply to the scorn Mr. Herbert Spencer poured on the claim Comte made to legislate for his followers, was instructive as well as amusing; and so is the apologetic tone taken by Mr. Harrison in defending Comte's claims. Fancy any Christian *apologetic* for Christ! Yet the claim Christ made and makes on His followers is not only thousands-fold more, but it is also of an altogether different and higher kind than that which Comte made, and which Mr. Spencer crushed with contemptuous irony; yet no Christian thinks Christ's claims too high. Mr. Harrison explains that much of M. Comte's legislation was only suggestive, and his followers may improve on it. Now Mr. Harrison is a devout follower, yet that does not prevent his thinking Comte's system may be improved upon; and surely had Christ been merely man, his followers would, after 1880 years, have had to make a similar apology, and would both have improved the system, and have known that they had improved it.

And again, such a mode of argument is quite within the comprehension of "plain men," neither can it be affected by textual controversy. Thus, when the "plain man" has once understood that Christ taught and lived in a manner quite incomprehensible, except His Divinity be granted, it will also be quite clear to him that Rom. ix. 5 may be read as the Unitarians wish without in the least affecting the question; while as the argument is now generally conducted, it is a very important text. Yet surely, many scholars must know that the Unitarian mode of reading the text is probably right.

And yet once again, such a mode of proof would be in harmony with Christ's own manner of teaching—that is, it would appeal to the *spiritual* rather than the *intellectual* side of man. "He cast out the Spirits by His Word," "He spake with authority"—yet the Word needed no instrument, and the authority no human support, and it is still so when Christ is present in the Church. Wheresoever there is His Word, and His authority, there is still spiritual power—which could not be if the original source had only been human. This mode of argument is exceedingly well summed up in an excellent essay—much the best we know of—on Hebrew prophecy, called "The Hebrew Utopia,"

by Mr. F. Adeney. There the author says (page 362): "Christ displayed His Divinity chiefly in moral and spiritual things. He did not uproot mountains, and pluck the stars from their spheres to prove His supernatural power; He did not anticipate the science of the nineteenth century, or foretell the history of the Victorian Era to show His supernatural knowledge. Even in His miracles the material power is subservient to the spiritual signification of the deeds; and throughout His life He revealed His Divinity chiefly in His truth and purity and love. He manifested the Spiritual God in a spiritual way, and revealed the God whose name is Love most clearly through His own surpassing love to men."

Of course we most thoroughly admit that when this foundation proof for Christ's Divinity is firmly laid, then Dr. Whitelaw's mode becomes of the utmost value, showing the teaching of the Apostles to harmonize with that of their Master, only it is a subsidiary proof, and should never be placed first.

We have left ourselves very little space for Mr. Meyrick's book; but we must find space to ask to be allowed to insist, that if when Mr. Meyrick asks, "Is Dogma Necessary?" he is alluding to laymen, then he must not, nor may anybody else, be allowed to go beyond the lines the Church of England has laid down. The only theological formula which a Church of England layman is called upon from his baptism till the hour of his death to assent to, is "The Apostles' Creed." That, and that alone, is required at his baptismal admission within the Church; that, and that alone is asked for at the deathbed as a sufficient proof that the man retains what he originally began with—the Christian's confession of a true faith.

And even more. Just as the one essential dogma of the Church of England is mainly a correct summary of the Life, Death, Resurrection, and work of the Christ, so, in harmony with the necessary truth that practice must accompany precept, is her definition of Christianity. For the same Baptismal Service gives a golden definition of Christianity—"remembering always that Baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour, Christ, and to be made like unto Him, that as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptized die from sin and rise again to righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

Of course we admit that those preparing for Holy Orders require more than this? but it would be most desirable if they also would thoroughly lay to heart the lesson of Tennyson's parable-poem, "The Palace of Art." The most correct dogma, if not animated by the love of Christ shown in love to humanity,—what is it like but that "Palace of Art," burdensome even in its very beauty. Theology and Life

Never can be sundered without tears
And he that shuts love out, in turn shall be,
Shut out from Love, and on her threshold lie,
Howling in outer darkness.

THE Bishop of Bath and Wells has conferred the appointment of Chancellor of the diocese, vacant by the death, on the 10th inst., of the Rev. C. W. Bagot, on Mr. T. E. Rogers, of Yarlinton House. Mr. Rogers is Recorder of Wells, and deputy-chairman of the Somerset Quarter Sessions.

GROWING OLD.

"Hast thou come with the heart of thy childhood back?"
—MRS. HEMANS.

Do I retain my childhood's heart? ye ask.
No, but far better! I have put away
The childish things, and schoolboy's slavish task,
That filled the opening hours of life's long day;
And ever, as I tread the destined way
Of life, which I so many years have trod,
I find it lightened by a heavenly ray—
I find it lead to freedom and to God.
And He will bear me safely through the wild,
Whatever joy or sorrow He may send;—
All is in kindness sent;—and reconciled,
And not a stranger, I shall wait the end;
Of God no more a servant, but a child;
Of Christ no more a servant, but a friend.

M.

REPLYING to an invitation from the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, the Bishop of Peterborough wrote: "I have much pleasure in accepting the office of patron, and trust that the Association may prove largely successful in reforming the cruel and wanton absurdities of our funeral customs." The Bishop of Llandaff also said:—"I have much pleasure in becoming a patron, as the work in which the Society is engaged is a good and much-needed work, and I shall be ready to do all in my power to promote the objects the Society has in view."

THE Archbishop of York has addressed the following letter to the working men of Sheffield:—"My dear friends—I learn with much pleasure that it is intended to hold a mission to promote temperance in the great town of Sheffield. It may, perhaps, be out of my power to take an active part in this work, which takes place at a time when my public engagements are most numerous; but I strongly commend to your attention and to your prayers the effort that is to be made. Almost all thinking men in the country—ministers of religion, judges, magistrates, and statesmen—are agreed that that which most hinders the moral and spiritual welfare of the people is the prevalence of drinking habits. The clergy know very well that it is impossible to hope that the truth of God will have free course amongst the people, and will prevail over sorrow and sin, so long as drink stands in the way. Drunkenness is punished not only in the person of him who commits, but in the persons of the wife and children, who are innocent of drink, and only deplore it. I invite you, then, in the name of my dear Lord, to join in this mission, to get as many persons as you can to attend it, to make every use of the instruction that will be given; and I ask all of you to give your prayers that God may bless this mission with much fruit."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Addison, Rev. James Salmon, B.A., and L.Th. (Durham), Curate of Holy Trinity, Bradford; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Keighly.
Atkinson, Rev. James Augustus, M.A., Rector of Longsight and Rural Dean of Aldwick; Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.
Bolland, Rev. H., Organising Secretary to the Church of England Temperance Society, Lincoln District.
Browne, Rev. S. Sidney, Curate (Sole-Charge) of St. James's, Curtain Road; Curate of Kelvedon.

Case, Rev. Frederic, M.A., Chaplain of Stockholm.
Chilver, Rev. Charles S., M.A., Vicar of Aldborough Hatch, Essex; Vicar of Lodswoth, Sussex.
Coles, Rev. Eimer Thomas, Vicar of Ashmansworth.
Cosgrave, Rev. W. F., B.A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Sunderland; Curate-in-Charge of St. Barnabas', Hendon, Sunderland.
Cudlip, Rev. Pender, Vicar of All Saints', Sparkwell, Plympton St. Mary.
Eager, Rev. Canon Thomas, M.A., Rural Dean of Ashton-under-Lyne.
Evans, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Gloucester; Rector of Preston, Ledbury.
Foster, Rev. H. C., Curate; Vicar of All Saints', Gloucester.
Gaul, Rev. Canon, M.A., and Rural Dean; Rector of Kimberley, Grigalland West, S.A.
Gauntlett, Rev. John George, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Swansea; Prebendary of St. David's Cathedral.
Grant, Rev. M., Head Master Diocesan Grammar-school, and Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Port Elizabeth, South Africa; Rector of Queenstown.
Groves, Rev. Charles Westley, M.A., Chaplain of the Borough Gaol, Nottingham.
Herdman, Rev. R. M., Travelling Secretary to the Mission of Scamen; Vicar of Holy Trinity, North Shields.
Hill, Rev. T. Lionel, B.D., Curate of Cookbeg and Inch; Rector of Kilmee, Diocese of Cork.
Jones, Rev. Richard Evan, M.A., Curate of Gresford; Rector of Llanllwcha, Newtown.
Kahn, Rev. Joseph, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Upper Holloway.
Littler, Rev. Frederick Charles, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist, Woking.
Macdonald, Rev. William Coules, Vicar of Stockingford.
Mason, Rev. George Holditch, M.A., Rector of Elmley, Kent.
Norton, Rev. Hector, B.A., Rector of Hunsdon.
Peck, Rev. John, M.A., Chaplain at Versailles.
Peck, Rev. Ashley Meigh, M.A., Rector of Adwick-le-Street.
Roberts, Rev. Henry Seymour, LL.D., Chaplain of the City of London Union, Homerton.
Scriven, Rev. Austin, Curate of St. Peter's, Rochester; Archdeacon of Vancouver.
Sweetman, Rev. M., Vicar of St. Mark, Bow.
Waugh, Rev. A. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Brighton; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.
West, Rev. Richard Temple, M.A., D.C.L., Chaplain of the Prison Home, Ealing Dean.
White, Rev. Francis Thirkill, M.A., Vicar of Birkinshaw-cum-Hunsworth.
Wilkie, Rev. Christopher Hales, M.A., Rector of Kingstone, near Canterbury.
Wilkinson, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul, Middlesborough.
Williams, Rev. W., late Vicar of Christ Church, Cockermouth; Chaplain of Henshaw's Blind Asylum, Manchester.
Winslow, Rev. Henry John Stephen, M.A., Chaplain of St. Marylebone Infirmary.
Wooll, Rev. C. W., Curate of Fairfield; Vicar of Ditton, Widnes.
Wyld, Rev. John, M.A., Minister of the New Church of St. Hilda, Leeds.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allwood, Rev. Samuel, Minister of the Mariner's Church, Hull, on the 15th inst.
Boydell, Rev. Edward Neville Valentine, Vicar of Wingate, Durham, at the Vicarage, on the 15th inst., aged 69.
Browne, Rev. Philip, Incumbent of St. James's, Edgbaston, very suddenly, at his residence, the Hawthorns, Edgbaston, on the 14th inst.
Browne, Rev. W., late Precentor of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, and Curate of All Saints', Woolahra, New South Wales, on the 17th inst., aged 32.
Cox, Rev. Richardson, Vicar of Tickenhall, Derby, on the 19th inst., in his 78th year.
Rowe, Rev. Richard Charles, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, at Farnham Royal, Bucks, suddenly, on the 21st inst., aged 30.
Stokes, Rev. William Henry, for upwards of thirty-two years Vicar of Goring, Oxon, at Edinburgh, on the 17th inst.
Stuart, Rev. Henry Cumberland, at Wragby Vicarage, Yorkshire, on the 16th inst., aged 51.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ARK'S PROGRESS TO MOUNT ZION.

BY THE RIGHT REV. CHARLES WORDSWORTH,
D.D., BISHOP OF ST. ANDREW'S, SCOTLAND.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE CHURCH CON-
GRESS AT CARLISLE, 1884.

"And David went up, and all Israel, to Baalah, that is, to Kirjath-jearim, which belonged to Judah, to bring up thence the Ark of God."—1 CHRONICLES xiii. 6.

WHEN the civil war, which followed upon the death of Saul, had been happily concluded, and when David was established upon his promised throne as king over the reunited tribes of Judah and of Israel, he was not slow to show himself sensible of the favours he had received from God; he bethought him of a service due and meet for the position to which God had called him. After the capture of the Ark, and its subsequent restoration by the Philistines in the early days of Samuel, it had been allowed to remain in the house of Abinadab at Kirjath-jearim. It could not be restored to Shiloh, its previous resting-place, for Shiloh had been destroyed in that fatal overthrow, which the sins of the priesthood had brought upon the land. Neither was it received, as before, within the tabernacle; for the tabernacle had been removed first to Nob, and afterwards to Gibeon, where it continued till the temple was built by Solomon; but separated from the tabernacle, it abode alone in that private dwelling-house for nearly fifty, or, as some have reckoned, seventy, years—a melancholy token of the alienation from God and from the spirit of true religion which had taken place in the hearts of the chosen people during the reign of Saul. But now there is a prospect of a better time. There may still be mistakes; there may still be failure of duty and of obedience, through ignorance or forgetfulness, after so long and fatal a relapse, and so God may still be provoked to vindicate justly His offended majesty; but there shall not be that open neglect of His appointed worship and of His presence among His people which had latterly prevailed. As we read in the preceding verses of this chapter, "David consulted with the captains of thousands and hundreds, and with every leader. And David said unto all the congregation of Israel, If it seem good unto you, . . . let us send abroad unto our brethren everywhere that are left in all the land of Israel, and with them also to the priests and Levites which are in their cities and suburbs, that they may

gather themselves unto us: and let us bring again the Ark of our God to us; for we enquired not at it (or rather, we enquired not after it, we allowed it to pass out of our remembrance) in the days of Saul." It is spoken with a forbearance which it will be well to imitate when we propose to repair the neglect of a former generation. Though no man ever received from another greater provocation than David had received from Saul, yet, tempering his zeal with that charity which is the bond of perfectness, he spares the memory of his departed predecessor, and speaks as though he and his people had been alone to blame, "We enquired not after it in the days of Saul. And all the congregation said that they would do so; for the thing was right in the eyes of all the people. So David gathered all Israel together from Shihor of Egypt even unto the entering of Hemath, to bring the Ark of God from Kirjath-jearim." This is one of many occurrences in the sacred narrative, which, from the simplicity and conciseness with which they are recorded, will be read, for the most part, without attracting the notice they deserve, until we are at the pains to examine the particulars with some minuteness. From the parallel relation in the Second Book of Samuel we learn that the representatives of the people in this great gathering amounted to no less than thirty thousand. It further appears that they flocked together for the occasion from great distances, extending from Egypt on the south so far northwards as to the Valley of the Orontes in Upper Syria. And for what did they assemble? Simply to form one great procession to attend upon the Ark in its way to Zion, a space from Kirjath-jearim of ten miles. "And David went up and all Israel to Baalah, that is to Kirjath-jearim, which belonged to Judah, to bring up thence the Ark of God the Lord, that dwelleth between the cherubim." The Ark, we know, was the symbol of the Divine presence. Upon it, as upon a throne, sat the majesty and the glory of the Lord of Hosts. From it His power proceeded, as had been seen in the dividing of the waters of Jordan, in the falling of the walls of Jericho, in the prostration and demolition of the idol Dagon upon the threshold of his own temple; and therefore it was that David desired to carry it, as a tower of strength, up into the new capital of his now peaceful and established kingdom. "And they carried the Ark of God in a new cart out of the house of Abinadab; and Uzzah and Ahio (the sons of Abinadab) drave the cart; and David and all Israel played before God with all their might, and with singing, and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets. And when they came unto the threshing floor of Chidon (a point of the journey where the road is steep and rough), Uzzah put forth his hand to hold the Ark; for the oxen stumbled," or rather (as in the margin, and 2 Sam. vi. 8) the oxen shook it. "And the anger of the

Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him for his error because he put his hand to the Ark; and there he died by the Ark of God."

Thus the august ceremonial which had given promise of a glorious issue over which all might rejoice, was converted into an occasion of gloom, of terror, and dismay. "David was afraid of God that day, saying, How shall I bring the Ark of God home to me? So David brought not the Ark home to himself to the city of David, but carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom, the Gittite. And the Ark of God remained with the family of Obed-edom in his house three months. And the Lord blessed the house of Obed-edom and all that he had."

But the pious design of which we have been speaking, though interrupted for a season by this sad catastrophe, was not abandoned. In the chapter which follows next but one, we read how David set himself not only to prepare a place (in Jerusalem) for the Ark of God, and to pitch for it a tent—a duty which had been before omitted; but in proposing to resume and complete its removal, as before attempted, he made provision which would secure the solemnity from the recurrence of the divine displeasure. The awful judgment which had stunned him at the first, after a short season had done what it was designed to do—it had awakened him to a sense of forgotten duty. He had been brought to see that though the punishment had fallen upon Uzzah only, the error had extended to others also, and not least, as he would now seem penitently to confess, to himself. Uzzah, it is true, through inadvertency or forgetfulness, had transgressed the law which forbade any but a priest to touch the Ark; but had due order been taken for transporting it—not in a cart, as the terrified Philistines had conveyed it back, but upon the shoulders of the Levites, of the family of Kohath (Numbers iv. 15), as the law commanded—had this been done, the occasion would have been avoided which led him to transgress. So all Israel and the priests and the Levites were gathered together to Jerusalem a second time, and David said unto the chief of the fathers of the Levites—"Sanctify yourselves, both ye and your brethren, that ye may bring up the Ark of the Lord God of Israel unto the place that I have prepared for it. For because ye did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought Him not after the due order."

Accordingly they did as David commanded. The procession was formed again in still larger numbers, and with greater solemnity than before; and all being now performed as the law required, so that we read, "God helped the Levites that bare the Ark," the pious undertaking was crowned with complete success.

Now, my brethren, I need not inform you that in all this there is something more than history, more as prophetic, more as typical, more as ex-

emplary. We know that these historical books of the Old Testament, because they possessed a prophetic character, were called by the Hebrew Church "the former prophets," and that they are comprised in the common designation of "the law and the prophets" in the New Testament. We may remember how St. Augustin in his great work, *De Civitate Dei*, remarks that the period from which Samuel began to prophesy, up to and during the seventy years' captivity at Babylon and the restoration of the Temple, is wholly a "time of prophets;" and he adds, "If that portion of Scripture which seems to be only historical, as narrating the succession of the kings and the events of their reigns, is duly considered with the help of the Holy Spirit, it will be found to be designed, if not more, certainly not less, for the purpose of foretelling the future than for relating the past" (Lib. xvii. c. 1). Further, we know that one of the Psalms composed by David to be sung on the removing of the Ark—viz., the 68th Psalm—is quoted by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians as having foretold what the procession itself foreshadowed—viz., the Ascension of Christ and the blessings which should flow therefrom upon every member of His Mystical Body (Eph. iv. 7, 8). In short, we see in all this great procession nothing less than the Universal Church of Christ partaking with the Divine David in the glory of His Ascension into the heavenly Zion.

And knowing all this, and bearing it in mind, what is it that we, as Christians and as ministers, whether clerical or lay, of the Church of Christ, may learn from the recital which has occupied our attention?

Obviously, as among its more general lessons, we may learn that periods of reformation, after past neglect, are those in which we need more than ordinary caution, lest we mar the work which is designed to promote God's glory. We may learn that all religious reformation which is the work of man can scarcely fail to be blemished and disfigured more or less by human infirmities; but that the effects of those infirmities are not to be acquiesced in, but to be confessed and corrected, if ever we would hope to obtain the Divine approval, or even to escape the Divine chastisement. Further, we may learn not to give over and abandon our good intentions—provided they be really good—not to abandon them, I say, because we have been checked and hindered in our efforts after amendment, but still to hold on and persevere in our exertions; only taking heed to profit by the instruction which the experience of past failure was designed to give. Above all, we may learn and take to ourselves the warning that "God will be sanctified in all them that come nigh Him," sanctified, that is, by obedience to His holy laws; as He showed no less plainly when Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, offered strange (*i.e.*, unauthorised) fire, and "there went out fire from the Lord

and destroyed them" (Levit. x. 2). And more than this, we may learn that ignorance and neglect, even when allowed to pass unchastised in others, may bring upon His ordained ministers the severest punishment, because it is they whose "lips should keep knowledge and the people should seek the law at their mouth" (Mal. ii. 7). But besides these lessons which it may be enough to indicate, there are two or three points to which I would desire to draw your attention at greater length, because while they arise no less directly from the same narrative they are capable, I think, of a more special application to the circumstances in which we are now met together.

1. First, then, every Christian has his place in that great procession, which is occupied in conveying the Ark of the Covenant (see Rev. xi. 19) up to its final resting-place in Mount Zion; but every Christian has not the same place. It is not certain that Uzzah was a Levite; but whether a Levite or a layman it was not lawful for him to touch the Ark. He touched it, and he was instantly struck dead; such being the penalty pronounced in the law upon any who, not being a priest, should touch any holy thing. Are we tempted to regard the punishment as disproportioned to the offence? If so, let us remember, that while we are unable to estimate the future consequences to the offender of such a punishment, we can estimate its design and its character as exemplary in the sight of the survivors. It was designed to give, most effectually, the special warning which was more than ever necessary after so long neglect, that in the things of God the distinctions which He Himself has ordained must be strictly kept. And shall we suppose that in the Church of Christ the same lesson does not apply? Then we must suppose that St. Clement, for example, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul, did not understand what has been ordained, and is required, in the Church of Christ. For nothing can be plainer than the language of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, where he writes in reference to the Church which had been Jewish, but was now become Christian:—"Where and by whom God desires His service to be performed, He Himself has fixed by His own Supreme Will, in order that all things being piously done, according to His good pleasure, may be acceptable unto Him." And then having (we may believe) in view the threefold ministry, which had been continued as a Christian ordinance, or if this be disputed, intending at all events to apply the general argument analogically, as equally available in the Christian Church, he proceeds:—"For to the high priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their proper place has been ordained; and upon the Levites their proper ministrations are imposed; the layman has been bound by the ordinances that appertain to laymen" (c. xl.).

Now we are all, I trust, anxious to promote the

Church's cause both on other accounts, and as believing it to be the cause of truth and unity, no less than the Ark was the symbol to the Jews of truth and unity, and was sought for as such by David after the civil war. To succeed in this great cause, we feel how absolutely indispensable it is that the whole body of the Church—that is, not the clergy only, but the laity also—should be put in action, and every member having found his own proper place, and having been made conscious both of his own proper influence, and of his own proper responsibility, should be openly seen to work in concert for the common good. All this, I trust, we feel; and further, we of the clergy are anxious that every opportunity, every encouragement should be given to our lay brethren to assert for themselves the position which they are entitled to hold. They will know, indeed, that they are not entitled—they have not been called—to bear upon their shoulders that which contains the oracles of God; and knowing also what are the duties of the priesthood in regard to the faithful guardianship of these oracles, they will leave to them the determination of points of doctrine. Unhappily at the present day there is a growing tendency not only to obliterate this distinction, but to set at defiance the fundamental principles of order which St. Clement has laid down. On all sides we may hear of men allowed and invited to preach the Gospel without being sent—without a commission of any kind. What is this but to preach the Gospel in defiance of the Gospel? What is this but to mislead, to disorganise, to break the ranks of the Christian army which it is professed by such attempts to form, to discipline, to command? And yet, my brethren, if we are to complain (as well we may) of such irregularities, let us take heed that we give no occasion for them by our own neglect. If we of the clergy withdraw ourselves from the duty which is all our own (as the Levites failed to carry the Ark with the staves upon their shoulders, and placed it in a cart), we at least cannot reasonably feel aggrieved if others undertake a work which is none of theirs. Their insubordination, their presumption may indeed be melancholy and disastrous; but it will be less melancholy, less disastrous, than indifference or supineness if found in us. "It is never well," said the good Bishop Sanderson, preaching at St. Paul's, in London, 1621, upon the text—"Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God" (1 Cor. vii. 24), and appearing to foresee the confusion that was soon to follow during the times of the Great Rebellion—"It is never well when laymen teach us what and how we should teach them" (Vol. III. p. 140 *seq.*). No! this is never well; and yet how shall it be avoided? There is, my clerical brethren, but one way of avoiding it, which though it may not always be successful, must, nevertheless, be always tried. It is, that we ourselves should be faithful to our high

calling; that we should do our very best to discharge it fully; that we should study, as the great Apostle did, "by manifestation of the truth, to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God" (2 Cor. iv. 2); that we should do, as the same Apostle again beseeches us: "Give no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed; but in all things approve ourselves as the ministers of God" (*Ib.* vi. 3, 4). And need I add that in this age of intense literary activity, it is more than ever incumbent upon us to take heed that in our treatment of the greatest, the most momentous, and the most enduring of all subjects, we do not suffer ourselves to be surpassed by the knowledge and ability, the care and pains which are daily bestowed by others upon the treatment of subjects comparatively trivial and unimportant, and pertaining only to the transitory interests of this present world?

And this may lead us on to the second point of which (for our common benefit) I desire to speak. It is not enough that we do, whatever we do, with a good intention unless what is done be also good, good in itself, and good in us. It is not to be doubted that Uzzah intended well in putting forth his hand and touching the Ark in order to prevent its fall when the oxen shook it. He intended well, but he did not on that account escape the fatal punishment of his forbidden act, whether it proceeded from presumption, from ignorance, or from inadvertency. And awful as that punishment was, I have already explained why it was so. Not that the sin of Uzzah admitted of no excuse; but that, be the excuse what it might, God accepted it not in opposition to His declared will, that the means which He had prescribed for securing the reverence and honour due to His own ordinances must be observed. And let it not be said, my brethren, that to us who are members and ministers of the Christian Church—to us who have been freed from the bondage of the ceremonial law by the liberty of the Gospel—nothing remains out of this fearful warning. Certainly there remains a great moral lesson: and I know not whether there be any which it is more important for ourselves, in the present circumstances of the Church, to bear in mind—viz., that no one on the plea of zeal for the Ark of God's Church should have recourse for the attainment of his end to doubtful expedients or unlawful means. In all times of more than ordinary agitation upon religious questions—of eagerness for real or supposed improvement, of impatience, and dissatisfaction with things as they have been or are—in all such times, this is a danger which besets even the best of men. Then it is that we have need to remember that the very action we may use in order to advance the progress of the Ark may serve most to check it. Our motives and intentions may be unimpeachable—such, for example, as the re-awakening of devotion, the defence of the faith, the removal or correction

of abuses, the edification of our brethren, the peace, the reunion of the Church, or whatever else may tend, as we think, to the promotion of God's glory and the Church's good; our intentions, I repeat, may be such as these; most unimpeachable, most praiseworthy; but this is not enough; we require more, much more than this, I do not say merely if we are to succeed in our attempts, but if we are to go unpunished for them. The competent knowledge of the matter which we take in hand, the disposition with which we act, the means which we are to use, the authority which is to sanction our undertakings—all must be such as are consistent with the requirements of God's holy law. Look into the history of the past, and see what consequences have followed from the neglect of this simple rule. At every great era of our Church's history this has been the stumbling-block over which it fell. And here I shall prefer to draw my instances from the history of the Church and country, with which I am myself more closely connected, rather than from your own more favoured land. Our Scottish Bishops and clergy in the twelfth century did what they did with a good intention when they invited or accepted the usurped supremacy of the Church of Rome. Our Reformers, lay and clerical, in the sixteenth century, did what they did with a good intention, when, justly rejecting that supremacy, they made havoc of our cathedrals, casting, as they supposed, an idolatrous worship "to the moles and to the bats" (Is. ii. 20). Their successors in the following century did what they did with a good intention when they bound themselves under a national covenant, which led to the overthrow both of the Altar and of the Throne; and even when they proceeded to kill their king, still they thought that they were doing God service (John xvi. 2). Their successors, again, in the next century, did what they did with a good intention when they drove out our fathers, and secured (as they fancied) for themselves and their posterity a purer system both of faith and worship. Doubtless at each of these periods there was occasion to fear on the Ark's account, for "the oxen shook it"; men like "bulls of Bashan," in the words of the Psalmist, beset it round (Ps. xxii. 12), and the road it had to travel was steep and rough. But in the attempts to rescue it there was an unfitness of the instrument; a defect of due authority; an ignorance or forgetfulness of the divine saying that the ceaseless punishment of the vast majority of mankind, and this for simple intellectual error, apart from any consideration of moral conduct, is not and has not been and never can be the creed of the Church, yet it must be owned that there has been some justification for the secularist view in the rash and random statements of certain Christian teachers. An orthodox believer may well join hands with an Agnostic in the condemnation, let me say, of

such a work as "The Sight of Hell," published *permissu superiorum* as a "book for children and young persons," by a Roman Catholic priest, the Rev. J. Furniss. What is the true and absolute doctrine of after-punishment, what should be said of it consistently, not so much with individual and isolated texts as with the general scope and tenour of the Christian Scriptures, is another question; and upon it I scarcely venture to say a word. Perhaps a careful study of the Gospels and Epistles teaches one to think that there are, if I may so say, two parallel lines of revelation which can never meet in this world, but will meet, as we humbly trust, in the world to come. But any one who reflects what the everlastingness of future punishment really means, and who feels the moral difficulty of believing it and the need of caution and consideration in laying it down, may be allowed to plead earnestly that, whatever be our own opinion of it, it should not be rudely flaunted, as a point of the faith, in the eyes of men who are strangers to the entire circle of Christian doctrine, and who will look upon it, not as a part of a great system, but as an isolated tenet of unspeakable horror.

So far it has been my endeavour to consider the difficulties which secularists feel in the system of the Christian revelation. I have tried to show that, when they are reverently expressed, they deserve the charitable consideration rather than the censure of the Church, and that they are not in themselves any adequate justification of the pronounced hostility which the secularist shows to Christianity. But when all this is said, what is the true answer to secularism? Where does it lie? Not, I venture to think, in rancour or the imputation of motives, although what we read is most painful, most unreasonable. Nor again in sensationalism, and the profanation of religious phraseology, as in the proceedings of the so-called Salvation Army. One of the most effective atheistical pamphlets I have read is little more than a juxtaposition of certain carefully chosen passages, some of them being the vagaries of Salvationist literature, and others the calm and philosophical utterances of a few enlightened and conscientious agnostics. The vulgarisation of religion, if for a while it attracts a portion of the populace, can only drive to a still greater distance the thoughtful infidels with whom in this paper I have sought to deal. There is one only way of meeting such infidelity. It is to go back to the elements of the faith. It is to present yet once again in its simplicity the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is to leave aside, as far as is possible, all that is legitimately doubtful and disputable in theology, and to point the eyes of men to the Saviour, Who lived on earth and died for all mankind. It is because I feel that the charm of His Divine Personality must work its gracious influence upon the hearts and consciences of men, even of those

who are most estranged now from His Church, if only the prejudice which they entertain against Christianity can be done away, that I have sought in this paper to see how far it is possible to meet and satisfy them in the difficulties they express. For, indeed, they do acknowledge the beauty of His character, although too often they turn their backs upon it. "When we consider His purity," says one of the most virulent of living secularists, "His faith in the Father, His forgiving patience, His devoted work among the off-scourings of society, His brotherly love to sinners and outcasts—when our minds dwell on these alone—we all feel the marvellous fascination which has drawn millions to the feet of this 'Son of Man,' and the needle of our faith begins to tremble towards the Christian pole." Yes, and there is more than this; for the radical error of any merely secular system of human life is that it takes no account of the deepest and truest human instincts, the sense of sin, the need of atonement, the desire and capacity for communion with the Divine Spirit, the intuitive apprehension of a life reaching beyond the shadows and limits of this world. This is the Gospel; and it is well worth every effort of the Church to consider the means of winning to it once again those who are now intellectually enemies of the Cross. The difficulty of meeting them is great; none can deny it. I have ventured to suggest that it will be wise and Christian to demand no more of them than the Church in her formularies actually requires. Whether this is the best method of Christian apologetics I dare not say. But I respectfully submit it to the Congress, adding only, in the spirit of the wisest of the Greeks, that I am willing if so be, to teach others, and as in other matters so especially in this, am not less willing to be taught by others myself.

By an order of Her Majesty in Council the vicarages of Ansty and Shilton, in the county of Warwick and Diocese of Worcester, have been united, and will henceforth form one benefice under the style of the united vicarages of Ansty-with-Shilton.

CARLISLE CONGRESS. — This Congress, now proceeding, promises to be a great success in point of numbers, and also in the general results of congress work. Its president, the Bishop of Carlisle, is one of the ablest prelates on the English bench, a man of robust all-round common sense, an able mathematician, and a well-known contributor to the best review literature of the day. Such a president helps a Congress to go off well. The situation of Carlisle is another element of success as it is within "measurable distance" of Scotland and the North of Ireland. The more that the clergy of sister churches can be attracted to these Congresses the better, and the opening services being preached by Bishops of England, Ireland and Scotland, showed a disposition to recognise brotherly relations. We hope to give details and fuller notice in our next issue.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1884.

POPULAR LITERATURE.

ONE of the subjects to be discussed at the Carlisle Congress is that of "Popular Literature, with reference to Infidelity and Public Morality," and among the speakers who have to deal with the subject we notice the names of the Editor of the *Leisure Hour* and *Sunday at Home*, the Editorial Secretary of the Christian Knowledge Society, and Mr. Horsley, the Chaplain of the Clerkenwell House of Detention, who has taken a prominent part in the work of the Church Temperance Society. This, we believe, is one of the most important subjects to be discussed, and we hope that what will be said will be useful, and to the point. The subject was discussed many years ago at the Liverpool Church Congress (although not stated in exactly the same form), and a very able paper was read by Canon Erskine Clarke, but since that time great changes have taken place, and popular literature has been on the increase, but whether for the public good and the best interests of the community we leave to others to judge. Certain it is that men are to a certain extent guided and their opinions formed by what they read in the papers, magazines, and other forms of literature, for the Press has certainly an immense power. We conceive that Churchmen, by tact and judgment, can do a great deal to promote the spread of popular and pure literature in their parishes, and if only good, useful, and withal *readable* publications are issued on the important questions of Infidelity, Socialism, Purity, and other kindred subjects, a great deal may be done to counteract the pernicious influence of some of the literature that is so widely circulated. One great means of promoting the use of good, wholesome, and popular literature, is in the establishment of

lending libraries, institutes, mutual improvement societies, and the like. Every large town has now its free library, where men can go and read the daily papers, and enjoy looking over the pages of *Punch*, *Judy*, and *Moonshine*, or the *Illustrated London News* and the *Graphic*, where some may be interested in the pages of the various magazines, where others may be turning over the pages of some book obtained from the shelves of the lending department. But it is in the larger towns principally that these libraries exist, and what is wanted is that they shall exist in other places—the small towns and country villages. In a correspondence which has been going on recently in the columns of the *Daily News* on "The Complaint of the Village," it has been stated with some truth that while many of the old village sports and feasts have been gradually abolished, nothing save an occasional tea-meeting or the annual Harvest Thanksgiving have been found to take their place, while another states that a Village Hall is necessary, and speaks of what true happiness and comfort would be obtained in such places if they existed—lectures, music classes, entertainments, social gatherings, the news-room, and the library, and the recreation-ground for rosy youth. It must be borne in mind that the country villages are largely drawn upon to supply the population of the growing towns, and that men and lads coming from these places where little or nothing is going on, and suddenly plunged into the full blaze and gaieties of town life, and not having enough mental ballast and power to resist temptation, fall away, and this may be one of the causes why there is the leakage from our ranks which so many complain of. The best and truest way to secure the adhesion of men, and to prevent their being led away by the delusive snares of infidel literature, and to give them a "pure mind in a pure body" is to supply them with good and wholesome, and *not* dull and prosy literature. It has been well said by one of the most earnest of the Evangelical clergy, now gone to his rest, that the Church had supplied her children with churches, and schools, but had left it to the devil to provide recreation. And so if we of the Church do not provide literature and recreation for our people others will. We may add that when difficulties arise in men's minds through the reading of any book, they should be encouraged to bring their difficulties to their clergyman, or some good earnest layman, and the subject must not be shirked, or evasive answers given; because if so, it gives *impetus* to the doubt which the book may have suggested. We believe that there are some societies which make grants of books to libraries, and would it not be well if those who make these grants would see what kind of books are really wanted. We have known of some being sent which are so dull that they are scarcely ever read. Go to any large reading room see what books are read, give them something similar, something

that will stimulate the intellectual appetite, and give them a keen relish for the good things which the stores of literature can supply. An old song of Dr. Watts's says, "For Satan finds some mischief still For idle hands to do"; and this want of employment, this want of mental food and mental culture, may be one of the causes why the moral tone is so low in many country parishes. In a word let there be amusement, good and popular literature, and a great step will have been made towards promoting the moral and intellectual tone of a parish. We believe that the societies are now publishing some handbooks to meet infidel objections, and if they are well-written, they may do some real good. The objections are raised not so much on the platforms, as in the workshops and factories, where one man of infidel opinions will propose questions, and will think, if the others cannot answer readily, that he has gained the day. And often in open spaces, on Sunday afternoons, groups of men will be seen discussing these questions. What better and more important work can the Church do than to give to her children simple, plain literature, which they can understand, by means of which they will be able to answer the adversaries, and give a reason for the hope that is in them; and so, with these on the one hand, and reading rooms and libraries on the other, together with hearty cordiality and sympathy, will something be done to promote a healthy tone among those who need to be held within the broad limits of the Church of England.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE'S ADDRESS TO THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

SEPTEMBER 30TH, 1884.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, MY LORDS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

It is nearly a quarter of a century since the first Church Congress assembled in Cambridge. I was present at that Congress, and had the honour of reading a paper, to which I turned the other day, with some interest, if not with profit. The perusal of the Report of the infant Congress had the advantage of bringing to remembrance some forgotten facts and supplying some useful topics of thought. It was interesting to observe that one of the papers was written by Richard Assheton Cross, B.A., M.P. for Preston, in connection with the fact that Sir Richard Assheton Cross has done good work both for Church and State since those days, and is about to read another paper in Carlisle. I found other names connected with the present Church Congress; I will mention one, because Congresses almost own him as a father and still enjoy his paternal care. I refer to Archdeacon Emery, who holds the office of permanent Secretary, and to whom I should be disposed to apply the words *sedet æternumque sedebit*, were it not that sitting still seems scarcely to describe the Archdeacon's character.

It is a far cry from Cambridge to Carlisle. There is scarcely as much resemblance between the two

places as Fluellen found between Macedon and Monmouth; for while both begin with a C, and for that matter both end with an E, the possession of a salmon river can be asserted only of Carlisle. I call your attention however to the manifest contrast between the infant as it was seen in Cambridge, and the full-grown Hercules which is to be seen to-day, for the purpose of indicating in a few words what are the special features of this Congress, and what have been the guiding principles of those who have been making preparation for it.

I should consider myself to be wasting your time, if at this time of day I undertook to expound the *raison d'être* of Church Congresses. It was necessary to do this in the earlier stage of their existence: it is not necessary now. To assert such necessity would be the most practical method of throwing doubt upon the truth which we desire to establish. The healthy, strong man does many things because he knows and feels that they do him good: he takes his exercise, he climbs his mountain, he gets his friends about him and enjoys their society: a medical opinion, signed by some distinguished physician would chiefly tend to prove that the man was out of health.

I shall assume therefore that the Church of England is following an instinct of health and strength in holding these periodical gatherings, and in discussing those great religious, social, and moral questions, which must ever be rising to the surface, and demanding consideration on the part of earnest and thoughtful Englishmen. I shall assume also that these gatherings have incidental advantages many and various, which need no description; and with these assumptions, I venture to point out, that while in many ways we must be content to look with humble respect to such a place as Cambridge, and may even fear comparison with the Congress held last year in Reading, with Oxford on one side of it and London on the other, we nevertheless have certain advantages which may justify us in the modest hope that this Congress will not fall below the average in general interest and in permanent influence.

For example, our Border situation is an element not to be forgotten. The relations between Carlisle and our Scotch neighbours have not always been of the most loving kind: any of you who visit our Castle will see the accommodation which in former days was provided by Reception Committees for visitors from Scotland. Those days have long passed; and I need not say that we have done what we could in the choice of preachers and the choice of subjects to prove our desire to hold out the right hand of fellowship to those who are willing to grasp it from the other side of the Border. I know that in speaking of holding out the right hand across the Border I have to reckon with the fact, that the religious body in Scotland chiefly interested in our proceedings claims only a small fraction of the population; but it is a very interesting fraction, and one connected with a remarkable history; one having (as I venture to think) great responsibilities and a hopeful future; one, moreover, enjoying in the minds of thoughtful Scotchmen an increasingly high position. The Seabury Festival, to be celebrated next week in Aberdeen, will bring to mind that a century ago, when the condition of this poor persecuted Church was very different from what it is now, she was able to confer a spiritual boon upon our Transatlantic brethren which was sought from England in vain. But I feel confident, that though it is only Scotch Episcopalians to whom we can consistently

send an invitation to take an active part in our proceedings, there are many of our Presbyterian brethren who will feel an interest in this Congress; possibly some may attend our meetings, if they do so, I am sure they will receive a welcome.

I have spoken of the Seabury Festival. The date of our meeting was arranged with reference to this event, and it was hoped that the American Prelates might pause on their pilgrimage to Aberdeen for the purpose of attending the Carlisle Congress. I grieve to be compelled to announce that circumstances have interfered with the fulfilment of this hope. I may say, however, that all visitors from our great sister country and our sister Church, whether Bishops, Priests, or laymen, will have a hearty greeting. One well-known American clergyman appears in our list of speakers; I trust that others may be induced to take part in our discussions.

To pass on to the arrangements made for the present Congress. We have followed to a great extent established precedents. In fact the little book which was published after the Derby Congress has made preparation for a Church Congress comparatively easy. We have ventured, however, upon one innovation. We have allotted to all who have been appointed to read or speak the term of twenty minutes, not dictating to them which form of utterance they shall adopt, and giving up the distinction between readers of twenty minutes and speakers of fifteen minutes, which has hitherto been the rule, while we retain the rule which allots ten minutes as the limit of speeches made by volunteers who send in their cards to the chairman. We have in fact adopted the policy of the Midland Railway Company, and have abolished second-class passengers.

One other innovation—though scarcely an innovation—will be found in our arrangements. We propose to give a more honourable and distinct place to working women than they have had hitherto. In one or more previous Congresses something has been done in this direction. The innovation, and, as we think, the improvement, which we have introduced, is this, that we intend to invite our working sisters to meet in all the dignity of this Congress Hall. We did not feel ourselves justified in contracting our series of subjects in order to compass this end, but we attain our purpose by holding the meeting on Saturday evening, which, though after the close of the Congress, will, as we believe, be practically convenient, especially if I am successful in persuading a few of our distinguished members to remain behind for the purpose of speaking at the meeting. I trust it will not be regarded as an evil omen that our meeting will be coincident with a total eclipse of the moon.

We have had probably the same amount of difficulty, neither more nor less, which has been experienced on former occasions, in the selection of subjects. Some two hundred were suggested; and this large number was reduced, by a process which has (I trust) resulted in the survival of the fittest, to the required limit of eighteen. Many considerations have to be taken into account in making selection; especially the existence of what are called *schools of thought*, or what, in less exalted language, are called *parties*. The fact is that in England, not in Church matters only, but in many others, we are under what may be described as a dual control: dual at the least, sometimes plural. We have two sides of the house in Parliament: two political organisations in every town and county: two newspapers in each place

which can support one: nay, we are expected at every railway station to take a side on the important domestic question of mustard; one manufacturer claiming our preference on the ground that his article is universally used; the other on the ground that his establishment is the oldest; while, as if to show that two schools of thought do not always exhaust what is thinkable, we find at some places an appeal from a third manufacturer, who, despising the *semper* of one competitor, and the *ubique* of the other, assures you that in his establishment there is *no adulteration*.

The admitted duality or plurality of schools of thought in the Church of England we have of course been compelled to take into account with regard both to subjects and to speakers. May I say that I see no necessary evil in this plurality? If we have *thought* in any true sense of the word, we must have diversities of thought: if men think at all, they will be certain to think diversely, and within limits appropriate to each particular subject diversely: absolute unanimity is not possible in a congress of men; it can only be realised in that perfect unity of utterance which distinguishes the cackling of a congress of geese. We who meet together in this hall to-day recognise our unity as loyal members of the Church of England; we recognise a still wider and deeper unity as members of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ; we have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all; but, subject to the conditions imposed by these great bonds of unity and union, we claim for each section, each school, each individual soul within the Church, that liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

To pass to the particular subjects which have been selected for discussion. It will not be necessary to dwell at any length upon our programme, the meaning and importance of the constituent portions of which the next few days must elucidate; but a short explanation may perhaps be given with advantage.

Some of the subjects have been suggested by special circumstances. For example, the duty of the Church with regard to the overcrowded dwellings of the poor is inevitably suggested by the issue of a Royal Commission of inquiry, and by the interest with which that inquiry is regarded: the discussion of the Church's duty in this Congress may be regarded as the recognition of this duty, and as the public avowal by the Church of her willingness to co-operate with the State in a great work of social improvement.

The question of England's religious duties towards Egypt is new, as England's political position towards that country is new. It is not for a Church Congress to discuss political questions, except under special conditions: but when political facts have developed themselves, and when statesmen, whether wisely or unwisely, have brought a nation into new relations with ourselves, we are within our right in asking the question whether those relations are purely political and commercial, and not also emphatically religious.

The lapse of just five centuries since the death of John Wycliffe has suggested a subject, which, though in one sense old, is also in a very real sense new. We have thought it impossible that the many voices which have been shouting out the name of John Wycliffe, and glorifying his memory, should not find an echo within the halls of this Congress. As claiming myself to be of Wycliffe's family, I may perhaps be permitted to feel a personal interest in this undoubtedly remarkable man. But we do not insist upon any glorification or hero-worship: we have challenged

the consideration of the influence of his work and his writings, and we have invited some eminent students to initiate a discussion upon the great question of the Reformation contemplated from the stand-point thus supplied.

There is one other subject which I venture to characterise as new, and which I trust will be found acceptable. We propose to ask in this English Congress what we can learn from Scotland and Ireland in religious matters. The proximity of Carlisle to Scotland, and to a large portion of Ireland, the peculiar and very different positions of the Church in each of the sister kingdoms from that occupied by it in England, and the presence amongst us of representatives of distinguished ability from each of the sisters, combine to commend this subject as one having a peculiar propriety in the present Congress.

There are several other subjects which I might claim as new; but I would rather call attention to the pains taken by the Subjects Committee to exhibit old friends with new faces. Thus we hope to have a lively discussion upon the wickedness of pews, in the battle against which we have frequent signals from Lord Nelson, that "England expects every man to do duty"; but we have so framed our thesis as to indicate that there may be other rights in Church than the right of each worshipper to do exactly as he pleases. Again, we have proposed for discussion the not altogether novel subject of Parochial Missions; but we have tried to cast its enunciation in such a form as to bring under discussion the beginning, the middle, and the end, and to suggest that while the beginning and the middle may be the most exciting, it is the end which is most difficult and which alone is valuable. Again, elementary education has often been discussed; but I think that for the first time the subject has been so formulated as to force the consideration, what can we do to save Board Schools from the curse of mere secularity, and to ensure that they shall be truly religious? Once more, Foreign Missions do not strike the ear with a novel sound; but they who know most of the home work of Foreign Missions will perceive that the subject as formulated in our programme touches a point of vital interest, which is of recent growth; I mean, the comparative advantages and the comparative claims of Missions directed by great Societies and of those which have a special organization of their own.

There is only one other subject upon which I think it necessary to make a separate remark. It was impossible not to find a place for the Report of the "Ecclesiastical Courts Commission." The question of legislation is a pressing one; and it is the question of legislation which has been specially propounded for discussion. When Parliament meets, does the Church wish, does the nation wish, that action should be taken upon the Report, or not? There will be wise and honest men on each side of the alternative; and it is well that wise and honest men should have the opportunity of expressing their opinions frankly and endeavouring to persuade others to adopt them. We cannot have monster meetings, such as are held upon secular questions, but we may help to form public opinion; and Church Congresses may endeavour to teach, not only the House of Lords, but, what is almost as necessary, the House of Commons, how it ought to behave itself.

Speaking generally of our programme, I will say that we have endeavoured to act in the spirit of the admirable motto of the City of Carlisle, which has

been adopted by the Congress—"Be just and fear not." We have shrunk, so at least we believe, from no subject because it was unpleasantly warm; we have blackballed no suggested speaker on the ground of party; we have tried to hold an even balance with regard to both men and things. If there are some names which might have been expected to appear on our list and do not, I may remind you that the list indicates not all those who were invited, but only all those who were able to accept the invitation; and if there be subjects the non-appearance of which causes surprise, I can only fall back upon the classical example of the groom, who, being required to put five horses in a four-stalled stable, frankly threw up the problem.

And so much for the proceedings which are to take place within our two Congress Halls. But before passing to actual business, I should like to invite you to look with me for a moment outside the Congress, upon the Church from which the Congress takes its name, and the people for whose benefit the Church exists. When the Congress met seven years ago, at Croydon, there were few passages in the opening address of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, which more completely carried his audience with him than the following—"The work before us," he said, "is great; the prospects of this Church of ours are not dark. . . . They are bright. Look abroad. What other country in the world would you change churches with? Look at home. Which of the denominations would you prefer? Look back. What age are you prepared to say it would have been more satisfactory to have lived in? For my part, I thank God and take courage. . . . God knows the age has its difficulties, and those very difficulties will, I doubt not, make you more ready to unite more closely in the great work which Christ has committed to this Church of England—that grand old historical Church, happily preserved to us in its distinctive features as they have come to us from the fathers of the Reformation." I thankfully take up such words as these, emphasised as they are by the thought that the lips and heart which uttered them are now cold in the grave; and I shall be thankful if anything seen or heard or done in this Church Congress shall, by God's blessing, tend to make men feel more deeply the privilege of having in our midst such a branch of the Catholic Church as the Church of England is and may be. I have quoted the bright, hopeful language of Archbishop Tait; let me quote a few words spoken in a very different tone, more than forty years ago, by one who was then, what I would that he were now, a Priest of the English Church—I mean John Henry Newman. "O Mother of Saints," he cries, "O school of the wise! O nurse of the heroic! of whom went forth, in whom have dwelt, memorable names of old, to spread the truth abroad, or to cherish and illustrate it at home! O thou, from whom surrounding nations lit their lamps! O virgin of Israel! wherefore dost thou now sit on the ground and keep silence like one of those foolish women who were without oil on the coming of the Bridegroom? . . . O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them? Why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love? How is it that whatever is generous in purpose, and tender or deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom and finds no home

within thine arms? Who hath put this note upon thee, to have 'a miscarrying womb and dry breasts,' to be strange to thine own flesh, and thine eye cruel towards thy little ones? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon them with fear, as though a portent, or thou dost loathe as an offence;—at best thou dost but endure, as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession, and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them 'stand all the day idle,' as the very condition of thy bearing with them; or thou biddest them begone where they will be more welcome; or thou sellest them for nought to the stranger that passes by. And what wilt thou do in the end thereof?" I am not going to criticise or weigh these terrible words: but that they should ever have been spoken by such a man is a fact of tremendous significance. What I should like to do, however, is this; to pass from the denunciation of barrenness and the prophecy of evil, which I have quoted from a sermon preached forty years ago, to the later utterance of Archbishop Tait and to our own experience of to-day. Look upon that picture and on this. Which corresponds more nearly to the actual truth of things? Where is the indication of the miscarrying womb and the dry breasts? where the jealousy and fear and distrust which are represented as paralysing all healthy action? where the evidence of children compelled to stand idle, or cast out, or sold to strangers? Let the answer be found in the work actually going on in our own country and throughout the world: let our churches and our mission rooms, with all their varied services and their efforts to bring the Gospel into contact with the souls of men, our organisations in favour of soberness, temperance and chastity, the self-sacrificing labours of holy women to lift the fallen and to save those ready to fall, let India and Africa and the isles of the Southern Sea—let all these give answer: nay, let us appeal to the programme of this great Church gathering, and when we have examined the catalogue of subjects to be discussed and the names of the men who are to discuss them, and still more the fact that men and women come from all parts to listen, then let us ask with hearts of thankfulness and gladness, Where are the signs that God has put the curse of barrenness upon our dear spiritual mother? Causes for anxiety, sources of weakness, calls to watchfulness, the presence of enemies in divers forms, dangers from the allurements of the world and the flesh and from the craft of the devil,—these things and the like belong to the condition of the Church Militant in our own country and time, as in all countries and in all times; but these sorrows are different in kind from the sorrow of sterility; they involve no curse, they imply no sin; they are simply the conditions under which the great battle is to be fought, for the fighting of which the Church exists. Why then should we quail with fear, or sink despondent, or lose heart and hope concerning the Church of England? Why not rather praise God for what she is and what she is able to do, and pray for increased blessing upon her?

O my mother! sorrows have been thine in times past and are thine now! thou hast foes without, lukewarm hearts, divided counsels, and too much of the world within: thy face is scarred, thy garments are soiled and torn: but thine is not the curse of the miscarrying womb and the dry breasts: God hath given thee the blessing of sons and daughters, and the wide world is their possession and inheritance. In days of

trouble, of rebuke, and of blasphemy, thy testimony to the truth is the chief bulwark of the Church of Christ: the best hopes of the world are bound up with thee and thy steadfastness in the faith once delivered to the Saints: we thy children are not ashamed, but we rejoice in thee and praise God for His goodness. "We will not fear though the earth be moved, and though the hills be carried into the midst of the sea." God is in the midst of thee, therefore thou shalt not be removed; God shall help thee, and that right early. The Lord of Hosts is with thee; the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ will be thy refuge now and for evermore.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

BENIGNANT NATURE.

SIR,—The power of the earth to arrest putrescence and convert malign matter, calculated to poison the soil, the water, and the air, into innocuous gases (the natural food of trees and plants, which emit vivifying oxygen) might almost be regarded as miraculous. Among numerous other phenomena, it proves the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Divine Author of creation, and causes us to laud His handiwork. Carlyle pithily sets forth this wonderful property of the earth. "You take wheat," he observes in his "Heroes and Hero Worship," "to cast into the earth's bosom; your wheat may be mixed with chaff, chopped straw, barn sweepings, dust, and all imaginable rubbish; no matter, you cast it into the kind, just, earth: she grows the wheat—the whole rubbish she silently absorbs, shrouds it in, says nothing of the rubbish. The yellow wheat is growing there; the good earth is silent about all the rest—has silently turned all the rest to some benefit too—and makes no complaint about it." The truth thus quaintly and pungently delivered is as old as Nature herself, and has been known and acted upon from the earliest times. It is this marvellous attribute of the earth, to make impure things pure that constitutes the great argument in favour of burying the dead, instead of having recourse to the heathen practice of cremation, as is the desire of certain scientists, owing to the abuses to which ordinary sepulture has given rise. In the *Dictionary of Hygiene and Public Health*, Blythe points out truly how "the present method of burial may be so modified as to remove many of the objections raised by those who advocate cremation." But Mr. Seymour Haden, the pioneer of the earth-to-earth movement, goes farther than this. In his letters to the *Times*, the eminent artist-surgeon avers "that were the dead only properly buried, not one of the evils incidental to ordinary sepulture would have any existence; that not a single dead body would remain to infect the soil, and that a quantity of land of incalculable value, now hopelessly alienated, would be liberated for purposes of hygiene or of utility." Even Dr. Tracy, the Medical Officer of Health of New York, in one of his essays (see *Buck's Dictionary of Hygiene*), commends Mr. Haden's method of burial, stating that "there can be no good objection to the plan, except a sentimental one." This is saying a good deal for a pronounced advocate of the furnace for human extinction. Mr. Haden, in a recent communication to a daily contemporary, urges that strong coffins should be rendered

illegal, and earth-to-earth made compulsory. It may possibly come to this one day, when the Government will deem it part of its duty to take charge of all matters that vitally concern the health of communities. In the meantime it is well that the public should be instructed on a subject that deeply concerns it, however repugnant that subject may appear. The New School of thought on mortuary hygiene is only following in the wake of antiquity, and advocating a practice general in England until the last few centuries. For several years past the proper resolution of the body has been persistently carried on at the London Necropolis, so that what is popularly known as "the Woking System" has grown into a household word. The ancient employment of woollen or linen cloths is improved upon by the use of the "earth-to-earth coffin," which has met with high commendation from medical authorities. This arrangement is more in harmony with civilised tastes, than the placing of the body in shrouds, and is equally as effectual as though the dead were committed to the grave without any barrier between them and mother earth. The horrible system of burial in vogue has been the outcome of vulgar ostentation, human vanity and wealth. "It is not, I think," notices Nathaniel Hawthorne in his *Passages from American Note Books*, "the most ancient families that have tombs, their ancestry for two or three generations having been deposited in the earth before such a luxury as a tomb was thought of. Men who founded families, and grew rich, a century or so ago, were probably the first." But the substitution of the *solid* coffin, which the Americans have rendered obnoxious in the extreme, is of earlier date. Mr. Haden attributes its origin to "the pretension which attends the acquisition of wealth without intelligence; when it was desired to keep the body for days for the purpose of giving it an ostentatious funeral; when the prosperous hosier or vintner aspired to the fashions and follies of his betters; when time was needed, not to honour the dead, but to open the pestilent vault and prepare the 'obsequious' mourning; and when a week was wanted to arrange the pageant which was to set out with the blazon of a mock heraldry." By thus obeying the carnal instincts of folly and fashion, we have added new terrors to that death which is not terrible at all, and thus, to reproduce the forcible language of *The Times* "dress the road to Heaven as if it were indeed, and could only be, the descent into a Pagan Tartarus!" The Church of England has a solemn obligation resting upon it to bring about a mortuary reformation based upon the earth-to-earth principle. Every member of the Church should take an interest in making general a mode of burial in harmony with the Burial Service and economic and hygienic in its results. The Church cannot be indifferent to the progress of sanitary science and the welfare and health of the nation.

CLERICUS.

SHALL WE CHANGE THE PRAYER BOOK?

SIR,—Your clerical correspondent, in his paper upon the Prayer Book, asks, "Is the last leaf of the Prayer Book, commencing 'a man may not marry his grandmother,' to be torn out or left in?"

In the first place I must remind your correspondent that the last pages of the Prayer Book contain the "Articles." The Marriage Law Defence Union (which

is expressly established to defend, and teach the people of England concerning marriage law) state in their Tract No. 6, page 1, that "The Table of Kindred and Affinity is no part of the Prayer Book, since it did not appear in the sealed copies which represent the book as it was sanctioned by Convocation in 1602." The Marriage Law Defence Union having upon its committee some fifteen or twenty Bishops, such a statement must certainly be the truth.

Secondly, the statement—"Wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in *Scripture* and *our laws* to marry together," is an untruth, and therefore unworthy of being bound up, as at present, with the Prayer Book.

"In *Scripture*." Where, in words that any plain man can understand as meaning such, is the marriage with a deceased wife's sister forbidden by Scripture? It is only by misinterpreting Scripture that any such prohibition can be assumed.

"*Our laws*." What is meant by the word "*our*"? Is it "Church," or "Church and State"? We will presume it is the two. The Archbishop of Canterbury, by his silence to the enclosed letter, which I addressed to his Grace (together with the correspondence between the Bishop of London and myself, published in THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT) has admitted that the Church of England has no law forbidding the marriage to the laity.

The "*State*" has no Act of Parliament containing any prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Months ago I wrote Mr. Murray, the Secretary of the Marriage Law Defence Union, asking him "where the *law* was to be found that his 'Union' were defending?" need I write that he was unable to inform me.

The answer I therefore must give your correspondent is that all lies should be torn from between the covers of the Prayer Book.

ALFRED COLE.

Hoxton, September 23rd, 1884.

[COPY.]

66, BRIDPORT PLACE, HOXTON, N.

September 9th, 1884.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I beg to enclose a copy of a correspondence between the Bishop of London and myself, upon the subject of refusing the Holy Communion to those men who have married their deceased wives' sisters. It would seem that his Lordship considers that it is entirely a question for a common jury; and that the Church of England, as represented by his Lordship in London, has no voice in the question.

Being of the opinion that it is not a question for a lay-court, but rather for the Bishops, I therefore most respectfully appeal to your Grace from the opinion of the Bishop of London, and in doing so would remind your Grace that the Church of England has never by any law which is binding upon the laity, forbidden the marriage; consequently there is no authority for the Bishops and clergy to refuse the Holy Communion to those so married.

This being a question of refusing what our Saviour has commanded, I most earnestly ask your Grace to consider well before you, as the Primate of the Church of England, refuse me what my Saviour has bid me receive.

I am quite prepared to prove that there is not a

shadow of a prohibition of such a marriage in the Bible, and am convinced that had Katherine of Arragon been Henry VIII.'s cousin, instead of his deceased brother's wife, the marriage of cousins would have been prohibited, and that of a deceased wife's sister permitted, by Archbishop Parker's Tables of Kindred and Affinity.

I would ask your Grace if the time has not come when clergymen of the Church of England should cease to preach as God's law the marriage law, which was adopted by Henry VIII. for his own lust?

I trust your Grace will not be offended at my plain writing, but should your Grace support the Bishop of London, I hope your Grace will tell me by what law of the Church of England I am refused the Holy Communion, otherwise I can only be the more convinced that the Church has no such law binding upon the laity.

ALFRED COLE.

To his Grace

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

THE Bishop of London's fourth visitation will be held in St. Paul's Cathedral from Monday, November 3rd, to Friday, the 7th, on which latter day his Lordship will deliver his charge.

BISHOP HELLMUTH, Suffragan-Bishop of Liverpool, is expected to arrive in England from his tour in America about the 15th inst., in order to relieve Bishop Ryle, who will be present in London during the autumn session of Parliament in his capacity as Chaplain to the House of Lords.

THE Duke of Devonshire has given a site for a new church which is greatly needed to supply the spiritual needs of Buxton. The church will stand in the parish of Fairfield, and the Rev. F. W. A. Wilkinson, the vicar, is setting about raising the necessary funds. It is contemplated to put up a temporary structure to begin with.

THE following paragraph appeared in the daily papers of Saturday:—"Next week elections will take place throughout the archdiocese of Canterbury for the members of the conference, and for the first time, in accordance with the Primate's desire, all communicants of eighteen and upwards, of both sexes, will vote for members of the ruridecanal conferences, which will select from their number members for the larger body."

THE official chaplain of the City of London Union has presented a report to the board of guardians complaining that the utensils with which he is provided for the administration of the Holy Communion are inadequate and unsuitable. They consist, according to his statement, of an earthenware breakfast plate, an ordinary glass decanter, such as is commonly used at dessert, and an old pewter cup. The matter has been referred to a committee.

ON Thursday week the Dean of Ripon presided at a meeting held at Christ Church School, High Harrogate, in aid of the Navy Mission Society. Dean Freemantle said:—"One point illustrated by the work of the society was that the navy was accessible to Gospel influence. The turning point in many of their lives was not that they had taken the pledge or become more temperate, but that they had been led to Christ. It was a mistake to suppose that navies were all common labouring men of low extraction. Some of them were of good birth and university

education, but they had been drawn aside, led into evil ways, and demoralised, and were compelled to make use of their muscles to obtain a living." Mrs. Garnett stated that last year 1,780 services, 1,000 Bible-classes, and 3,350 night-schools had been held in various parts of the country.

DEAN OAKLEY has invited the Guild of St. Matthew to Manchester, and has promised that he will secure good attendances for their meetings. We do not know how far the Dean can rule the people of Cottonopolis in this matter, but so far as we are aware the people of London will not regret the absence of the Guild while they are in Lancashire or elsewhere. One of the ruling spirits of the guild is the Rev. Stewart Headlam, who frequently assists Canon M'Coll at St. George's, Botolph Lane; and as part of the programme of the fraternity is to champion Mr. Bradlaugh, and generally to advocate Radical and Socialistic principles and abolish the House of Lords, the Lancastrians may look out for something in the nature of strong food from these very advanced and happily unattached members of the Church of England.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baring, Rev. F. H., M.A., Vicar of Chilworth.
Bolton, Rev. H. S., Perpetual Curate of Ravenhead.
Bulwer, Rev. Henry Earle, M.A., Rector of Stanhoe-with-Barwick, Norfolk.
Caton, Rev. Redmond Bewley, M.A., Rector of Wiverton, Norfolk.
Clarke, Rev. Charles Pickering, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, South Wimbledon.
Gausson, Rev. C. E., Curate-in-Charge of the New Mission District, Windmill Hill, Bedminster, Bristol.
Gibbs, Rev. William C., Vicar of Abingdon, Berks; Rector of Hagley, near Stourbridge, Worcester.
Heffill, Rev. Alder, Vicar of Church Minshull.
Hirst, Rev. Jermyn Shephard, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Kahn, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Upper Holloway, and Chaplain to the Shadwell Road Workhouse.
Lyne, Rev. Augustus Adolphus, Vicar of St. Saviour's, Westgate-on-Sea.
Massey, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Wretham with Wretton, Norfolk.
Piggott, Rev. T., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Upper Holloway; Vicar of Bishopstone, Lewes, Sussex.
Pollock, Rev. F. D., Vicar of Kingsley.
Richardson, Rev. Piercy John, Curate of St. Philip's, Dalston; Vicar of Seaton-with-Beer, South Devon.
Senior, Rev. Charles John, M.A., Vicar of Blatchford.
Thornhill, Rev. Albert Frederick, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Upper Holloway; Vicar of Temple Grafton.
Wilkinson, Rev. R. P., Vicar of Longparish.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Berrington, Rev. William Morgan Davies, J.P., Rector of Nolt-on-cum-Roch, Pembrokeshire, at Druidston, Haverford West, Pembrokeshire, on the 21st ult., aged 82.
Giles, Rev. John Allen, D.C.L., formerly Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford, and Rector of St. Nicholas, Sutton, for nearly seventeen years, at the Rectory, Sutton, on the 24th ult., aged 75.
Lefroy, Rev. Anthony Cottrell, of Church Crookham, Hants, sixteen years Vicar of Longdon, at Longdon Vicarage, Tewkesbury, on the 28th ult., aged 72.
Pigot, Rev. Hugh, Rector of Stretham, Cambridgeshire, at Tunbridge Wells, on the 22nd ult., aged 65.
Simmons, Rev. Thomas Frederick, Rector of Dalton Holme, Canon of York, at Langford, East Somerset, at the house of his brother, on the 26th ult., aged 70.
Ward, Rev. Arthur R., M.A., St. John's College, and Vicar of St. Clement's, Cambridge, at his residence, 46, Jesus Lane, Cambridge, on the 25th ult., in his 55th year.



The Church of England Pulpit.

TENDERNESS AND COMPASSION.

BY THE REV. F. B. GUY, D.D., HEAD MASTER
OF FOREST SCHOOL, WALTHAMSTOW.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL
ON THE 13TH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, SEP-
TEMBER 7TH, 1884.

"Go and do thou likewise."—ST. LUKE x. 37.

THESE are the concluding words of our Sunday Gospel. They express the point of the parable recorded in it. This parable is said to be "peculiar" to St. Luke. More than half of the parables recorded by St. Luke are peculiar to his Gospel—sixteen out of twenty-five are peculiar to it.

For one moment let us consider what is meant by this word "peculiar" applied in this way. Does it mean, as a merely critical expression, that these parables are to be found in the Gospel of St. Luke only? Nay, rather, does it not mean that these parables, said to be peculiar, are appropriate, suitable to the Evangelist St. Luke, to his character? Is there any indication that the record of such parables as we find in St. Luke is suitable to his character? The characteristic feature of the Gospel, as of the parables peculiar to it, is said to be "universality." Let us use more simple language, and say that a spirit of tenderness and compassion for all mankind, the spirit of self-sacrifice, runs through it. There is one other Evangelistic store of parables in the New Testament: in the Gospel of St. Matthew, and their characteristic feature is shown in teaching the kingdom of God and its development. These parables are peculiar to St. Matthew; why should, in contrast, the feature which has been specified be the prominent feature of the parables of St. Luke? Doubtless he had heard many more than these; but as each man selects—or shall we not say, is selected?—to impart special truths, to enforce, accentuate, special portions of the whole counsel of God, so it would seem as if St. Luke, who was chosen by God to give us the Gospel history in its fulness, was by the Spirit of God led to bequeath to the Church for all time, in his own peculiar way, those parables of tenderness and compassion, among which the parable of our Gospel for to-day stands out pre-eminent.

St. Luke had *realised* the tenderness and compassion which are divine, and it is appropriate to him to record this special teaching of the Saviour. What indications are there of this? It had been

his task to trace down, from the first, the course of the stream of divine love, to trace all things accurately, even, to use the Evangelist's own words, "as they delivered them unto us which from the beginning were eye-witnesses." Had he not surely from the first been brought into contact with one of those eye-witnesses, the only one who could have delivered a considerable part of the early story—one whose heart, pierced with the sword of anguish, had in the divine compassion of her Son and Saviour become a monument of tenderness? How delicately, how sweetly, this lies concealed from the superficial reader in these words of the Evangelist St. Luke; but the influence has been imperishable.

Now this Evangelist of tenderness differed from his fellow-Evangelists in that he was a man of refinement and education, in the popular sense of those words, a man of accomplishments, a man who took pleasure in his accomplishments. Living in his early years among men of cultivated intellect, his own profession above all others demanding habits of taste, and exact observation, and cultivation, he gives evidence in his writings of the influence of these powerful elements in the formation of what we call character. There is only one other New Testament writer in this particular like St. Luke—his companion in after years, the companion to whom he was so true a man of like accomplishments and learning also, the author of fourteen Epistles—he alone, of all the New Testament writers, can be compared to St. Luke for what is called literary excellence.

Now this is the point I wish to bring home. Here is a man, accomplished and refined, to whose character it seems appropriate that he should present to us mainly, as the pattern and teaching for all men, as the example of life for us all, that side of the Incarnate life our Lord Jesus Christ, which we express by the words mercy and compassion.

Is it that St. Luke found in this an antidote to the dangers which are only too commonly the lot of persons, as he was, highly educated and accomplished? These gifts, such as his, are too often in a degree a hindrance to religious practice, a hindrance to the obtaining of that gift for which we pray in the Collect to-day, true and laudable service. Did he find in this view, if I may so say, of Christianity, that it counteracted the tendency to forget the "duties" of life? Was the contemplation of the Lord Jesus Christ in His ever going about doing good, ever preaching the principles of self-sacrifice, of doing justly, of loving mercy, of walking humbly, the one thing needful to enable him to assert his Christian life? For, as it has been said, it is "beautiful in a picture to wash the disciples' feet, but the sands of the real desert have no comeliness in them to compensate for the servile nature of the occupation." These preliminary remarks may help us to appreciate the more

the lesson in the parable of our Sunday Gospel, the parable of the Samaritan. May I not take for granted that it is familiar to you all?

There is indeed a something about the parable which on the surface, catches the modern mind, arrests our popular feeling, in fact carries away the sympathy of the uninformed in a way which was never designed.

As the Pharisee, so the Priest and Levite in this parable, found wanting in their secret life, where none is there to see, kindle an abhorrence, natural, if I may so say, to what, for lack of a better word, I will call the anti-clerical feeling of the multitudes around us, and with that the interest ceases. These words are not words of sarcasm or words of irony. But, my friends, is it not true, that as these words of the compassionate Saviour are read amongst us, is there not a popular tendency to see in them merely a satire upon *clerical* selfishness, *clerical* blindness and narrowness, and exclusiveness, and to rest in the story merely—to make, in fact, this parable of Christ, a mere allegorical story in which the mind is satisfied to look no farther than the allegory itself. The imaginary persons are put in the very places of the real ones, and the persons who figure in it are invested with the attributes of those represented as if they were real persons. To such the consequence is plainly declared, “that seeing, they shall see and not perceive; and hearing, they shall hear and not understand.” Let us bid such to cherish with every heart effort this abhorrence of clerical degradation, of the intolerance of the priest who journeying homeward to his priestly city, after the fulfilment of his priestly duties in the order of his course, passed by on the other side; of the yet more degraded inferior minister of the law, who did even worse than the priest, basely looked on, came and saw the sufferer lying half-dead, and then (as the other) passed onward, unwilling to be detained, or disturbed or distressed, or perhaps implicated, by relieving the misery of the man whom he did not feel it to be his duty to succour. But remember we have a *parable* of Christ before us. This parable is to lift us, who profess to be disciples of Christ, out of the mere circumstances of the affecting drama, out of the mere circumstances of class and caste. It is a parable “peculiar” to that Evangelist whose characteristic is “universality.” It is a parable for all time, of practical teaching, for every soul of man, it has, as we teach our children to say, its earthly story, with its heavenly meaning, wide as the very heaven, a meaning which it is conveying to every generation, in every corner of the earth, the great, only “reforming,” practical truth of the ties of neighbourhood.

Who is my neighbour? asked the lawyer. Did the Lord answer him? No, not directly, the question was made the occasion of saying more than a mere answer.

Our Lord “took him up.” The lawyer asks,

Who is the proper person to whom I am to act the neighbourly part? And the Lord answers by turning him upon himself, and pointing out who and what sort of man he must needs be to act the neighbourly part. The priest was a neighbour, the Levite was a neighbour, the Samaritan was a neighbour, but the neighbour’s heart was only found in him, who, fearless and true to human instinct of the highest kind, sacrificed self.

The lawyer was intending rather to find out what our Saviour thought, and what knowledge he had of the Scriptures, than to profit by the answer.

This is much like our case, dear-brethren, when we hear a sermon, or read a religious book out of simple curiosity, without applying what we hear and read to our own case. He had said, “What shall I do?” yet not truly intending to do it. “What shall I do to inherit eternal life,” asks the lawyer.

The Lord said unto him, “What is written in the law, how readest thou?”

Look in God’s Word, what does that say. In the Holy Scripture you have a fountain of life and of truth open to you, from this you may ever draw, from this storehouse of practical religion you may always find guidance. You, as lawyer, read the law and teach the law to others, what does it say to you about your duty in this matter? It is the very object of your life to teach and to explain. How readest thou? And the lawyer gave the best summary, which the best teaching of his nation had by this time rendered common. Jesus confirms his answer, “This do and thou shalt live.” True piety does not consist only in knowing the truth or feeling its beauty, but in active service. It is not enough to believe and to hope, but we must love also, and show our love in our actions, “This *do* and thou shalt live.”

But he, willing, desiring, to justify himself, *i.e.*, out of the natural impulse and self-seeking desire to make his conduct appear righteous; not on any reasonable resolve, but purely out of an ungenerous prompting, vexed perhaps that the appeal had been made to the law, anxious to cover his retreat, as it would seem, retorts impatiently, “And who is my neighbour?” The very question stamps the man.

Now, what is the upshot of the parable for us? That we cannot be mere lookers-on; that we must have an active sympathy with those around us. None may refer this questioning away from himself to others; but who can deny our tendency to do this? If we do not fossilize, so to say, the characters of this drama, if we do not let them stand before us like figures in a piece of sculpture, inanimate, or as portraits in a painting of bygone scenes, do we not too often regard these beautiful pictures in the parables as forms merely deeply interesting, but outside of our life? Does it not seem as if it would be an anachronism to bring them down into our own lives of this very day

here in this vast city? Ah! we too often catch the spirit of the ungenerous questioner, unwilling to acknowledge this individual man, the Samaritan. Just as the lawyer preferred to reply to our Lord's searching appeal to his conviction, speaking of the Samaritan in a roundabout, half-hearted way, as "he that had mercy," so we do not like to acknowledge the living Man as a real Man of flesh and blood, whom we are to imitate. We too often, half-hearted, jealous, "willing to justify" ourselves, assenting of necessity, but unwillingly, more like Balaam of old, utter the words of truth, and the words have a purity and sweetness which we seem to taste, but do not see their power. It may seem a platitude to say, here and now, that the ancient code, "to do justice, to love mercy, to walk humbly," reiterated in this parable of to-day, is to be our rule in practice, is the only rule which can be given to us, would we desire to know what we are to "do to inherit eternal life;" or when, narrowing our question, we ask, Where is the proper field of operation for the exercise of our being? Everywhere, always, the "good Samaritan" has to be our example; the "*Go and do thou likewise*" is not limited by the conditions of life as they exist among us now. And again it is not a parable for guiding us in our ministration to inferiors only. Did I now repeat once more the revelations of a "*Bitter Cry*," and lavish words in depicting the misery and distress which abound all around us, from which customs and maxims, religious and social and political, seem to bar our relief and our power to help, and pass by altogether the general lesson; this would be a mistaken limitation of the parable's teaching. But for the moment I will ask you to look at it in this light.

Whatever may have been the tone of the bidding to the lawyer, "*Go and do thou likewise*," whether in stern and calm reproof, or in sorrow for the man's blindness, for us it is eloquent and as forcible as words of rescue. Do we go? Ah, my friends, do we not rather follow the Levite and the priest in their so-called "religious" duty, with our own selfish purposeless loitering, half-conscious that there is about in the air a terrifying something, half-alive to a sensation that we must save our own lives, forgetting that he that would seek to save his life shall lose it; do we go? Nay, my brethren, and here is the message which the parable seems to me to bring us in these days—do we not, instead of thus "going," actually quit the sight and neighbourhood of those on whom we ought to have compassion? Do not Christians, blessed by God with culture, accomplishments, refinement—is not their tendency to—leave the very sight of those whose poverty and misery, whose wounds and sorrows, need the oil and the wine of human consolation. It was not always so. The Church of Christ, in her very essence, binds together the whole community of mankind. She does this by no artificial, self-invented means, but

by the very fibres of her being; the nerves and sinews with which she works as a corporate body are the unifying power, because they are instinct with the life of God. Is it a dream, or is it a vision of that which may one day be real, actual, practical, a fact upon earth, to believe that the local separation incident to caste and class of this our present condition shall cease to be inevitable. In our social life the great and acknowledged difficulty with philanthropic minds is this local isolation of classes. There is an avoidance of contact, there is a separation, there is a migration. And why? Is all the cultivation, and refinement, and grace of religion and of education, and all the sense of what is beautiful—is taste and virtue, in its widest sense—are all these things to drift away, and to drift together; not to mature, not to ripen, not to dwell together in a perfection of peace and happiness, not in godliness and piety (how could it be?), but to present a spectacle such as angels weep over, of wasted energy and stunted growth, or of sentimental, vapid, purposeless, and contentious existence.

I am speaking of moral and religious life among us in our vast and crowded towns and cities. At this moment Christian men and women do shrink from the claims of the ties of neighbourhood. You may read in the journals of the day that this huge metropolis was declared by one who seeks to be an evangelist amongst them, to be "the most religious capital in Europe." Religious in one sense, indeed, it may be, but in the true sense! How the heart sickens to hear of such a daring flattery! No, brethren, let us not lay such unction as that to our souls. God be thanked, there has been all along a witness of the principle of our religion, of the comprehensiveness of this religion which binds men together, in the mere fabric of the Church, and in the schools and the clergy still left to testify in the midst of the dreary, crowded, wealth-forsaken quarters of our vast cities; men and women, not mere institutions, still left to bear witness to the reality of our faith; cultivated men and women, to live in lanes and streets side by side with the very, very poor, quite away from "society," by their presence acting as deputies for the throng of the better class who have fled from the proper objects on which they might, so profitably, exercise their Christian gifts.

It is a question—we will call it a question—how are the difficulties, the dangers, incident to this local separation of classes to be met? The reply is, Why perpetuate, why should we continue to create this separation? Granted that it is hopeless to go back. Is it really a necessary consequence of the influx of the poor that the rich should depart? Why this retirement from the occupation and the claims of property in some of the districts of our vast towns, so that the speculator may rear his dreary tenements, soon to become the habitations (homes we may not call them) of squalor and

misery? Is it a necessary condition of things? Are the Christian virtues to be exercised and bear fruit by deputy? Nay, are the lower incentives to beneficence, viz., pain at the sight of suffering poor, abhorrence of contact with what is vulgar and degraded, disgust with the baser conditions of our common humanity, are these to lose all the influence which they were intended to exercise, are they only given that they may lead men to hide themselves from the proper objects, to shut themselves up, fence themselves round by the flimsy veil which at any moment may be torn down by the masses, so we call them, the masses, goaded on in their yearning after that which, we confess, is truly theirs as ours?

Again, are we to stigmatise as mere eccentric enthusiasts, such as would try to do more than contribute of their money, more than to build hospitals and charitable institutions, more than to dispense tracts and occupy platforms for a few brief hours of excitement and misdirected talk, in "dissipation," as it has been called, more than all this, by giving themselves personally, yea, brethren, to eat and to drink with them, to live with them?

Is it really a necessary condition of our modern life, that we must pass by on the other side, or when we are at the place, come and "look on" and do the same?

Are we for ever to bemoan these sorrows as hopeless, are we not to preach loudly, in season and out of season, to the light-hearted, well-to-do folk, who begin to feel the nearer and nearer approach of the poor around their snug property as a something evil from which they must fly, are we not to preach to them the ties of neighbourhood—that there is such a claim as that. Ah, how we rob our children of the opportunity for doing good, for kindly interest in the poor and needy, for graceful waiting upon sick and weary, for help and comfort of many wayfarers, who, as they travel in their confidence and simplicity through the wilderness of this world, fall victims, as did the "certain man" of the parable.

And do we not need to take heed lest we be found, nay, verily, scoffers at the good Samaritan who comes in with his tenderness and compassion, who in the journey of life will not forsake his brother in his need, but pour in oil and wine, into the wounds of suffering, yea, sacrifice his own progress that he may bear along with him his suffering brother, and let him share in the good things and the cheering things, and win others that they too may take care of him.

Are we to shudder only at the ignorance, and cruelty, and foul language, at the profane jest, at the blasphemy; are we not to anticipate all this, by the effort to be living companions, God helping us, among our fellows; by our own efforts after purity and justice and reverence, and by a united worship with them here upon earth, as we must worship with them hereafter; by sympathy and

tenderness and compassion—happy graces, gifts to do God a laudable service, which are given us only that we may use them hourly. If these graces be not exercised, then our life, our real life becomes vain, indolent, superficial. These so-called evils among our "masses" (a word painful to use) become helps to the soul that claims to overcome them. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts becomes a sunlight to brighten. The theory of well-doing must not be alone, there must be the practice of well-doing. Let us learn from the scientific world. In that vast gathering of men of science the other day, words were uttered which I will repeat now, words approved by the loud cheers of those who heard them, words which stand out as a beacon for us who profess to be Christians. Assuredly, how the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light! The speaker was referring to the progress of man's intelligence in the discovery of truth, as forming solid groundwork for further research: "Thus does the human intelligence oscillate between sound theory and sound practice, gaining by every contact with each an accession of strength. These two things are the soul and body of science. Sever sound theory from sound practice, and both die of atrophy. The one becomes a ghost, and the other becomes a corpse."

And finally, brethren, let us see in this parable something more; let us see in it the work of Him who pitied fallen man and had compassion upon him. There he lay, half-dead—not wholly dead, still a conscience witnessing for God—stript, robbed. Many passed us by: Abraham passed us by! Moses passed us by; Aaron passed us by; patriarch, prophet, priest passed us by; but there came one, the true Samaritan, He, all compassion, tenderness and love, could not pass us by. He, like this Samaritan who set the wounded man on his own beast, placing himself by his side, He, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor; He brought us rescued into his Church, gives us of His salvation, though he quits us, though it be expedient that He go away, makes a provision of grace sufficient for us till He come again.

Oh, adorable Saviour, give us eyes to see Thee, to learn of Thee, to be one with Thee in all that we do, that our tenderness be Thine, our compassion Thine, that we go and do likewise!

ERRATUM.

WE regret that our printer last week substituted a portion of the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon's paper on "Popular Literature," for the conclusion of the Bishop of St. Andrews' Sermon. From the twelfth line from the bottom of page 160 it should have read as follows:—

an ignorance or forgetfulness of the Divine laws

—the law of obedience, the law of unity, the law of charity, and brotherly love. It was a wise precept of Lord Bacon to the clergy of his own day, in a tract entitled, "Of the Pacification of the Church"—"You must rather leave the ark (of the Church) to shake, if it so please God, than put unworthy hands to hold it up," (p. 367). And even if the person himself be worthy, so far as to have satisfied the requirements which admitted him to the sacred office, yet the hand may be unworthy; and unworthy it will be if it be not held out to all in brotherly love; if it seek to advance its cause by the use of weapons which for the Christian, and still more for the Christian minister, are not lawful—such as personal detraction, unjust or improper censure, secret misrepresentations, and the like; if it exercise authority not properly its own, if it be not guided by the principles which, even under the elder dispensation, God Himself has prescribed: "To obey is better than sacrifice," "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," that is, I will have obedience to the moral law in *all its circumstances* and in *all its breadth*, rather than obedience to the ceremonial law under any circumstance whatsoever, be it never so certain, be it even not of man, but of God. There is one more point which I desire to notice, and I shall do so, very briefly. I mean the constant caution and watchfulness, which, my reverend brethren, we all require, in consequence of our necessary familiarity with sacred things. The Ark having remained so long in his father's house was probably the cause of Uzzah's fault. He had ceased to regard it with due reverence. He had become careless and presumptuous in the offices which he discharged towards it. The familiarity of which I speak is beset with snares—the snare of formality, the snare of supineness, the snare of arrogance, the snare of superstition, the snare of affected but unreal earnestness; and consequently it is full of danger to all who presume upon it in proportion to its preciousness when used aright. For let us not forget that the same emblem of the Divine Presence which brought sudden and awful death to the family of Abinadab brought abundant and abiding blessings to the house of Obededom. While we seek to profit by the warning which *that death* conveys, let us take comfort from the encouragement which *this blessing* gives. In ministering about the more precious Ark, which has received the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, the only true and all-sufficient atonement, so long as we are careful to keep, each of us, his own place, to do each of us his own work, and to proceed, each of us, in the way of obedience which God's Word prescribes;—so long may we be humbly bold in our approaches to the throne of grace; so long may we rejoice with reverence that we have been called to take part in this saving ministration; so long may we hope to intercede effectually for those to whom we minister.

Meanwhile it will be our bounden duty to seek to make ourselves acquainted more and more with the whole Word of God, that it may be "a lantern to our path," and to the path of all whom we have undertaken to guide. It will be our duty to pray that, in seeking to mend whatever is amiss, we may not be tempted to become hasty and presumptuous, but that our love towards God and towards men "may abound in knowledge and in all judgment" (Phil. i. 9). It will be our duty, while we receive with patience and submission the rebukes which our misdeeds may have provoked, still to persevere without discouragement in our good designs; and while we devote ourselves to the discharge of our sacred calling in godly fear, not unmixed with cheerfulness and holy joy, still it will be our duty to look for the forgiveness and acceptance of every service solely from the mercy of God, for the sake of His dear Son and our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Acting thus, the Gospel which we preach, and which unhappily is to many a "savour of death" will be unto us the "savour of life"—the source of all comfort in this world, and of everlasting blessedness in the world to come.

It is announced that an anonymous donor has cleared off the remaining debt on St. Peter's, Harrogate, amounting to several thousand pounds.

THE Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, late vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, has taken up his residence in the parish to assist in the work among the poor. Shortly after his resignation of St. Peter's, London Docks, a few months ago, the Bishop of London granted him a licence.

MERCERS' Chapel, Cheapside, having been closed for some months for repairs, was re-opened for service on Sunday evening last, a short opening service having been also held on the previous Friday. The chapel has been re-floored and re-seated throughout with carved oak stalls and seats, new choir-stalls, prayer-desk, and pulpit; the organ has been rebuilt and enlarged, and all the walls and the ceiling have been painted and richly decorated in gold and colours, and the sanctuary wall enriched with three frescoes, the large centre one being a representation of the Ascension, and the two side-panels respectively, the "Martyrdom of St. Thomas à Becket," to whose memory the original chapel was dedicated, twenty years after his martyrdom, on the site of his birth-place; and the "Donation of the land to the Mercers' Company by his sister." By the reseating the accommodation has been nearly doubled, but, notwithstanding this, the chapel was quite full on the opening night. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Arthur Veysey, chaplain to the Mercers' Company. While the chapel has been closed the services have been carried on in the neighbouring church of St. Olave, Jewry, which is doomed to destruction. A correspondent writes:—"It only seems natural to ask, If Mercers' Chapel can be filled in this way, why not St. Olave's? To destroy a church without the direst necessity seems to me to savour of sacrilege."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1884.

CHURCH BOARDS.

WE live in an age of societies; every year adds to their number, and all of them are started to promote some special object; one of these, which has just held a meeting at Carlisle, is the National Church Reform Union. There is no doubt that in some things *reform* is urgently needed, and abuses want rectifying; for instance, the scandal which has been caused by the jobbery in the sale of next presentations, the placing of aged and infirm clergymen into livings, so that a sale on the chance of early possession may be more readily effected; there are also other things which need reforming with a wise and gentle hand, but which it is not now necessary to mention. Judging from the programme of the National Church Reform Union, we very much doubt whether the proposals are likely to be received with much favour by the great mass of churchmen, or whether it is possible that they may be adopted. The desire which is expressed to associate the laity with the clergy in the religious and philanthropic work of the parish, is one which no one can in any way object to; in fact, if we mistake not, the parish is in a very poor state where the laity do not join with their clergy in these works, and there is no need for any Society or Union to promote this. The next object is "to secure sympathy between the parishioners and the ministrations of their parish Church, and while facilitating modifications of the service, when such are desired, to protect the parishioners from the dictation of an incumbent whose ecclesiastical leanings may be out of harmony with their own;" and thirdly, to provide for the removal of a clergyman who is unable to conform to the joint demands of his bishop and his parishioners, without re-

sorting to litigation and imprisonment. To bring about this state of things, the Church Boards Bill provides that in parishes where they adopt it, a Board elected at a vestry meeting by the parishioners, or other persons duly qualified, shall within the limits sanctioned by law decide upon any changes proposed. Here then we have proposed nothing more nor less than the system in vogue among the Congregationalists and Baptists, the only difference being that in the case of the Church the Board shall be elected by the parishioners, while among the sects mentioned, the body who shall decide matters are the Church "members," assisted by the Deacons, those gentlemen of whom Mr. Spurgeon is reported to have said, "Resist the devil and he will flee from you," but resist a deacon and he will fly *at* you." The avowed object of the National Church Reform Union is to promote sympathy between the parishioners and the ministrations of the parish church, but surely there ought to be sympathy between the pastor and his flock, and if there is none, then it is very certain that no true work for God can be carried on; and while the Bill which the Union supports seeks to protect the parishioners, it does not thoroughly protect the parson from the interference of a body of men elected at a vestry meeting by parishioners, or "other persons duly qualified," whatever that may mean. It may be said that no body of men who would constitute a Board would behave ungraciously to a clergyman. But are we sure of that? It might not be so in a parish in Belgravia, or any parish where the bulk of the people who would take an active part would not be anything but Christian gentlemen; but all places are not alike; take for instance a small manufacturing town. There is no one of greater importance than say the owner of the works, or colliery, or foundry; after him come those who are under him, and then the shopkeepers, and a few others; and a body of these men, because they are parishioners and rate-payers, are to decide what shall be done in the church, and what the clergyman shall do, and what vestments he shall wear. Further the Bill does not provide that they shall even be communicants, but a "packed" meeting—for as a matter of fact vestry meetings are very often packed—can elect a Board who shall settle matters, the only one saving clause being that an appeal can be made to the bishop against the caprice, illegality or factiousness of the Church Board; but while this is being done, what discord and division will be aroused, especially if it should happen that the bishop's ruling should be against the wishes of the Board. We have no admiration for the modern invention of Boards as controlling and administrative bodies, and would prefer to see the powers and duties of churchwardens enlarged. Both of the churchwardens ought to be elected by the parishioners for say five years, and have control over all the temporalities of the parish.

We are afraid that the provisions of the Bill will not be acceptable to the bulk of churchmen; yet we must say that we do not think that parishioners should be neglected, or that their wishes should be set at naught with regard to the conduct of Divine service. No clergyman who is wise will make alterations without consulting his people. It is well known that there are cases where a self-willed, obstinate man may offend a great number of his people; but these instances are very rare. There is one method which has been adopted with great success in many parishes, and that is the establishment of parochial councils, which shall confer with the vicar and churchwardens on any proposed change in the mode of conducting Divine service. We have known instances where these councils have been productive of the best possible results, and if the clergy will but consult the wishes of their congregation (not necessarily giving up any principle), good-feeling and harmony will be promoted, while at the same time, misapprehensions and doubts will be removed, and the bond of sympathy strengthened. But this is very different to giving the parishioners by legislation full power to elect a Board. It might be the means of bringing the faults and failings of some clergymen to light, but will the world be benefited, and the cause of the Church strengthened by seeing the faults of clergymen paraded before the world? The Union states that the Board would have no power "to encroach on the legal position of the parson, nor authority to dictate to him an iota of his opinions or his teaching; in spiritual matters the incumbent would be, as he is at present, supreme. But it might cause friction, and bring about that very thralldom from which clergymen have been so thankful to be free. The spectacle of internecine war between the Church Board and the clergy would tend more than anything else to bring about what the enemies of the Church wish to see, viz., Disestablishment. Let the laity be considered, their sympathy gained, and there will be no need for any Church Board to decide ecclesiastical matters; churchmen have it in their own hands to make the Church so strong that there will need no outside element to rectify what are called "abuses."

THE CARLISLE CHURCH CONGRESS.

BY REV. COURTENAY MOORE, M.A., RECTOR
OF MITCHELSTOWN, CO. CORK.

I VENTURE to send you some impressions of the above Congress, in an informal sort of way, not following the order of its proceedings regularly, nor reporting any of the speeches or sermons, or even portions thereof verbatim, but merely giving a gossiping sort of outline of part of what I saw and heard. Except for its position in the far North, Carlisle would be an excellent Congress centre. It is a fine, flourishing cathedral city, invested with many interesting

historical associations, and its railway and hotel accommodation are all that can be desired. The Bishop of Carlisle has also all the necessary qualifications of a first-rate chairman of a Church Congress. He is full of life and energy, and is a very ready and attractive extempore speaker. He is evidently most popular in his diocese, with all sorts and conditions of men, and his personal influence evidently furnished a large element of the success of the Congress. The attendance was fair, considering the position of Carlisle, as already referred to, and the discussions, if not very brilliant or striking, were temperate and harmonious. On the opening day there were three sermons preached respectively by the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Derry, and the Bishop of St. Andrew's. The Archbishop preached at the Cathedral, and here a few facts in connection with it may be interesting. There is now but a fragment of the nave with aisles, a transept and choir with aisles, and a central tower. The destruction of a great portion of the Cathedral is attributed to General Leslie, who in 1645 pulled down the nave, chapter-house, and cloisters for use as fortifying material in defending the city. Among objects of interest in the Cathedral the following may be noted:—a very fine brass in choir floor representing Bishop R. Bell, vested, and with pastoral staff, date 1478. On the back sheeting of choir stalls painted legends of Saints Anthony, Cuthbert, and Augustine, date 1400. Restored tomb of Simon Leahouse, Prior of Carlisle, time of Henry VII. The capitals of the pillars in the choir are carved emblematically of the different months of the year, e.g.:—

1. *January*.—A figure of Janus clothed in a loose robe, and exhibiting three faces, representing January as looking back to the past, onward to the future, while the front face pictures the present. The two outside faces are represented drinking, and have a reference to the festivities of Christmas-tide.

2. *February*.—Here we see a man similarly clothed, but hooded, and seated before a fire, his whole attitude and surroundings representing the cold weather common during that month.

3. *March*.—Husbandry now begins, and we have a man hooded, digging the ground with a spade.

4. *April*.—The weather is supposed now to be getting less inclement, so we have a man with his hood thrown back. He is at work with a hooked knife, pruning a tree.

5. *May*.—A woman holding a bunch of greenery in the shape of a conventional lily, which she presents to a young man.

6. *June*.—The hawking time. A man, bareheaded, and on horseback, with a hawk on his right fist, in his left a bunch of roses. The rest of the capital is ornamented with roses.

7. *July*.—Now mowing is going on, and we see a man at work with a scythe.

8. *August*.—A man with a conical cap, indicating the heat of the weather. He is surrounded with thistles which he is cutting down with a hook, and we see ears of corn intermingled with the thistles.

9. *September*.—Again a figure with covered head, and in a field of wheat, but this time at work reaping the corn.

10. *October*.—Here the workman's head is covered with a handkerchief, and he is busy cutting grapes with a hooked knife.

11. *November*.—This time we see a man sowing corn, and the foliage represents oak leaves with acorns.

We have also a swineherd with pigs, which are supposed to be feeding on the mast.

12. *December*.—A view of Christmas festivities again, for on this capital is exhibited a man with an axe preparing to fell an ox, whose head is held by another man.

Of more modern features of interest :—

Paley's grave in north aisle of choir. Memorial tablet to Paley under east window, "W. Paley, D.D., Archdeacon and Chancellor of this diocese, died May 23rd, 1805, aged 62." There is also a handsome Paley Memorial Pulpit in the choir.

Memorial window in transept with following inscription :—

"This window put up (*sic*) by public subscription in memory of five of the children of Archibald Campbell Tait, D.C.L., Dean of Carlisle, afterwards Bishop of London, and Catherine his wife. They died within this abbey between March 6th and April 9th, 1856. Their bodies lie buried in Stanwix Churchyard.

"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away,
Blessed be the name of the Lord."

The inscription on the tomb in Stanwix is as follows :—

"Here lie the mortal bodies of five little sisters, the much-loved children of A. C. Tait, Dean of Carlisle, and Catherine his wife, who were all cut off within five weeks. March 1856." The texts Rev. xiv. 4, and Isaiah xl. 11, are quoted as part of the inscription.

The Archbishop of York, who preached on the opening day of the Congress, was attended to the pulpit by two clergy, probably chaplains. He delivered a very able discourse on the subject of the cessation of miracles and prophecy in the Church, and urged upon the clergy the necessity of fitting themselves to deal with the infidel objections of the day. He seemed to take a low view of their present capacity as a body for such a task, and pressed the duty of preparation for it upon them. The author of the "Laws of Thought" naturally referred to such a subject, but many of the clergy, indeed most, will have to be content with trying to assimilate the researches of others in this field, and while it is most desirable that a clergyman should be equipped for such controversies, so that if occasion arises he should not be taken defenceless and unawares, it is more of an open question whether he should ever preach upon such subjects unless he is really "up" in them, or introduce them at all in the pulpit to simple and uncritical audiences.

The Cathedral was densely crowded during the service; the musical portions of it were very beautifully rendered; it was grand to hear—

The storm the high-built organs make,
And thunder music rolling shake
The prophets blazoned on the panes,

while the anthem at times suggested Schiller's line—

Wie Stimmen der Engel im Paradies.

Talking of the "panes," the east window at Carlisle is a splendid one; the glass in the arch dates from 1360, the height of the window from the sill to the springing of the arch is 58 feet, width 32 feet, and the glass of this portion cost £3,000; it contains no less than sixty-three subjects.

After the services at the Cathedral and other churches, the president delivered his address in the Congress Hall. It has already been reprinted at length in the PULPIT. Like everything else which he delivered, it was most effective and successful.

In the evening of the same day there was a discussion in the Drill Hall, on what England can learn from Ireland and Scotland in religious matters. The feature of this debate was the speech of the Bishop of Derry. Probably not a few English churchmen think Ireland a sort of "awful example," but the eloquent bishop made out a good case for the Irish Church; on the whole the tone of the meeting was sympathetic and friendly, and the bishop's reference to the loyalty of Irish Protestants during the terrible winters of 1881 and 1882 was very warmly received. What a rich established and endowed church can learn from a poor voluntary church is like what a rich man may learn from a poor one, struggling with adverse circumstances. The same subject in a more general way was afterwards debated under the title, "The Advantages of an Established Church." At this meeting papers were read by Lord Carnarvon, the Bishop of Winchester, Messrs. Grey and Leighton, M.P.s, &c. Of course English Churchmen would be extremely foolish and criminal to lightly yield the advantages of their position, and though they may not be "within measurable distance" of adverse parliamentary action, yet it must be remembered that if occasion arises Mr. Gladstone can proceed by "leaps and bounds" with destructive legislation. It is therefore well to be forewarned and forearmed. As regards the Irish Church she has had great difficulties thrown upon her by the Church Act of 1869, but, thank God, she has on the whole come well out of them. If she trusts in God, as she will do, and has also a due measure of self-confidence without self-conceit she may afford under her peculiarly difficult circumstances an example which in some respects (*viz.*, those arising from these peculiarities) may be useful to other larger and richer communities, which pride themselves on having "much goods laid up for many years."

It is, of course, impossible, and indeed it is not necessary to attempt to go into detail regarding the numerous meetings during Congress week. One, which was very largely attended, dealt with "Results of Recent Historical and Topographical Research upon the Old and New Testament Scriptures." The opening paper was read by the Bishop of Durham, who, by the way, is not at all unlike Dean Reichel in face. Papers were also communicated by Captain Conder, R. E., Canon Tristram, and Professor Hull.

On the evening of the same day the working men's meeting was held, and proved an immense success. The Bishop of Carlisle, referring to the fact that the Bishop of Peterborough had addressed the first meeting of such a kind in connection with Church Congresses, said he hoped his audience had had the pleasure of hearing Bishop Magee at some time, otherwise, as an Irishman said to a friend who told him he had never tasted whiskey, "Ah I pity ye!" he was inclined to say to them if they had not yet heard him, "Ah I pity ye!" As usual, Bishop Goodwin was the heart and soul of the occasion; those who know him only as a writer, and fancy him "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," will be undeceived when they see him, and if he had only a bit of the brogue he would make a capital Irishman.

The Congress wound up with a conversazione in the Drill Hall given by the Mayor of Carlisle and Mrs. Dixon. The Bishop of Winchester said that it struck him as being the most largely attended conversazione he had been present at. As I did not leave immediately after the Congress was over, I had an

opportunity of seeing some places of interest within reach of Carlisle, including Durham Cathedral and Castle, and part of the Lake District. Some of the churches in it are very interesting, *e.g.* Crosthwaite Church which is just outside Keswick. It is probably hardly an exaggeration to say that as regards mountain scenery, this is one of the most beautifully situated churches to be found anywhere. But it has other features of interest, it is said to be 800 years old, and contains a monument to the poet Southey, who lived at Greta Hall near Keswick. In the churchyard is his grave with the following inscription on the stone.—

Here lies the body of ROBERT SOUTHEY, LL.D., Poet Laureate. Born August 12th, 1774, died March 21st, 1843, for 40 years a resident in this Parish. Also of EDITH his wife, born May 20th, 1774, died November 16th, 1837.

"I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord."

Some lines by Southey are upon another part of the tomb :—

Not to the grave, not to the grave, my soul,
Descend to contemplate
The form that once was dear.

There is another very interesting grave-stone in the church-yard inscribed as follows :—

IN PEACE,
GEORGE GONVILLE GOODWIN,
Born September 18th, 1851.
Vicar of this parish, January 13th, 1878.
Fell asleep in Christ, March 4th, 1878.
"Jesus saith thy brother shall rise again."

This Mr. Goodwin was a son of the Bishop of the Diocese; he had been curate of the parish of Crosthwaite about two years, and died about six weeks after his appointment as vicar. Some will remember the very touching funeral sermon preached by his father at the time of his death, which was printed in the *Guardian*.

The little church of Wythburn, between Grasmere and Dale Head, on the coach road from Windermere to Keswick, is interesting because of its age and size; it is said to be the smallest church in England. In Carlisle itself the old castle is well worth a visit, the dungeons, in the fullest sense of the world, are regular "black holes." The Guide says that many of the prisoners incarcerated there in 1745 died, no doubt from want of air. The cell of "Fergus MacIvor" is pointed out; it is rather better lighted than the dungeons. Mary, Queen of Scots, was at Carlisle Castle for about a year on her last journey south. From the top of the Castle and also from the Cathedral tower there are very fine views of the city and surrounding country. You can, on a clear day, see across the Solway Firth into Scotland. The view of Carlisle from Stanwix, on the farther side of the Eden, a river about the size of the Blackwater, is very fine indeed. Carlisle being a border city, the English and Scotch elements are naturally a good deal mixed. The accent of the people has a decidedly Scotch element, and the climate is decidedly bracing. With regard to Durham Cathedral and Castle I feel unequal to any detailed description. The situation of both is beautiful. Every one knows Scott's reference, now incorrectly quoted, perhaps, from memory :

Where its Cathedral, huge and vast, looks down upon the Wear.

Certainly the Cathedral is huge and vast, and its exterior impresses one more than the interior. Probably this is owing to so much of it being Norman work, which is so much heavier and less graceful than Gothic. In pre-Reformation times

there were forty-two altars in this Cathedral, which fact will also give some idea of its size. Among objects of interest pointed out are the site of the shrine of St. Cuthbert, his supposed tomb, the Chapel of the Nine Altars, the Galilee Chapel, which had three. In this Chapel is Bede's tomb, inscribed as follows :—

Hæc sunt in Fossâ Baedæ Venerabilis ossa.

Bede, I believe, was never called the "venerable" in his lifetime, and it was the exigencies of a Hexameter line that produced the title by which he has since been so well known. The "Venerable" Bede and the "Judicious" Hooker seem alone among English churchmen to rejoice in such designations. There are some of Bede's valuable MSS. in the Library, and relics of St. Cuthbert, including a pectoral cross, portable altar, and some of his vestments. Cromwell laid his heavy hand upon Durham, as he did on so many other English Cathedrals. It was turned into a prison after the great battle of Dunbar, and the woodwork of the choir was then all destroyed, and tombs were defaced. Carlisle Cathedral seems to have been similarly used, as the carving of the prisoners is still to be seen on the choir stalls there. In Durham they perished completely, and were replaced afterwards by Bishop Cosin.

The Castle at Durham, now used as a University, is a most interesting place; it was the Episcopal residence formerly, and is on a scale of great magnificence, suitable to the revenues of the Prince-Bishops. The dining hall, tapestried galleries, private chapel, etc., etc., are all most interesting to the clerical visitor. There is one portrait of a former Bishop of Durham that is an object of interest beyond all others, viz., Bishop Butler's. His reputation is not that of family connection or professional material wealth, but it is the undying fame of intellectual power of the first order which has made his name imperishable as an English theologian.

On Sunday morning, the 5th inst., the Rev. Luke Rivington, one of the Cowley Fathers, preached in Carlisle Cathedral. He is apparently about fifty years of age, and has been much engaged in Mission work in India of late years. He preached from the text, "Now is the day of salvation," and defined salvation to be "the due adjustment of the relations of a man's soul to God and his neighbour." He is a preacher of a rare class; he has not only a fluent supply of choice language, but a command of graceful and descriptive action, an expressive play of feature, and a power of modulating his voice, which are seldom to be met with in the pulpit. Nature has done much for him, and Art has added to his natural gifts. At the same time he is evidently thoroughly in earnest, and he leaves no particle of impression that he strains for effect or is in the smallest degree self-conscious. At times he is quite "rapt," if one may use such an adjective, and again his voice, in deep pathetic tones, draws tears from the eyes of his hearers. Men and women were visibly affected by him. He is more the French type of preacher than the English, and as Father Benson, the head of the order, is a preacher of the same type, it is probably recognised by the Cowley Fathers as the best style and studiously cultivated.

But it is time to bring these notes to a close. Church Congresses are now quite an institution in English Church life, and a valuable one. They benefit the clergy and laity who attend from distant places, and they benefit the local clergy and laity;

they reach the general public through the medium of the Press, in which the debates are published. Eminent men in the State, as well as in the Church, attend and take their share as readers and speakers. Thus the Congress opens the door for a valuable amount of lay help. There is of course at Congresses a sameness of subjects and a sameness of speakers; but, take them all in all, and they serve most important ends; they are popular, and deservedly so, and as time goes on experience will doubtless teach their organisers to make them still more useful agencies.

ELIJAH'S ERROR.

(Communicated.)

FOR a man who was, in the estimation of the Israelites, from the time of his life till the Christian era, the greatest of all the prophets, the particulars which we have of Elijah are very-few. We have the childhood, the education, the biography, private and public, and the death, of Samuel, the Father of the Prophets. Elijah bursts on the history in the Book of Kings like a meteor; we have nothing of his early life, and we do not know what discipline he was subjected to while his character—one of the strongest that ever appeared among the sons of men—was being formed. In common with Samuel, he had two qualities that are uniformly treated in the Bible as the greatest that men can have—the highest civil courage, and unbounded zeal. Zeal is a quality invariably spoken of by the inspired writers with applause, expressed or implied; no man is ever said to have had too much of it. Characteristics that men admire, and value highly—subtlety, counsel, and wisdom, good as they are, and useful, are second to this. Ahithophel came to a dreadful end; the close of Solomon's life was melancholy and empty; but when Samuel died, all Israel mourned him; and Elijah's departure was glorious with a glory that approaches in intensity the ascension of our Lord.

But no man, except One, was ever perfect. The circumstances of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel during the tenth century before Christ were not such as would be likely to produce soft characters. Times of civil war, of contests between opposing religious systems, develop extremes of cowardice and extremes of the noblest heroism. There was abundance of slaves and turncoats in the age of Knox and Coligny; and the contemporary of Elijah—the undaunted man who reproved kings and did not shrink from prophesying evil of them—was the miserable creature who took to his bed because he could not get an acre of land to square off his park. The fault of zealous men is not softness, nor is it zeal; it is that fierceness which is the product, not of their zeal, but of the intolerable evils that surround them against which their souls revolt.

I believe that under the influence of that fierceness Elijah committed the great error of his life, and I think this, not deriving it from anything that the Bible says, but from what it leaves unsaid. No word is uttered in condemnation of the slaughter of the four hundred and fifty impostors, Baal's prophets; but the things that followed that act of justice or of vengeance are recorded for us to draw our conclusions from them.

Miracles have been wrought almost always before an evil and adulterous generation, and their effect on the minds of those who have witnessed them, has

scarcely ever, however great at the moment, been as permanent as from the nature of the case one might without knowledge of the events be likely to expect. That this is so, and probably that this must be so, Abraham told Lazarus across the gulf. When, in answer to Elijah's prayer, Jehovah sent down fire from heaven, and the sacrifice was consumed, the response of the spectators was unanimous, overwhelming, and immediate. Elijah was not contented with his moral and spiritual victory; he was resolved to have a political victory too. Then a reaction set in; the queen put herself at the head of it. She, it is true, had not witnessed the miracle, but she must have heard of it; possibly she thought nothing but that Elijah was a greater magician than the prophets of Baal; and she was excited, not by holy dread of the mighty God, but by hatred against the persecutor of her religion.

Elijah, fled, and his faith began to fail. There was a reaction in him from his own fierceness, perhaps even from his own zeal. He began, imperceptibly no doubt to himself, to doubt whether there were a God at all. "I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life to take it away." He almost reproached Jehovah for being untrue to His own cause. But God comforted him. He told him that he was not alone; He restored his prophetic power; and He led him to the faithful man who was to be his servant and successor.

Was the Lord, who was not in the tempest, nor in the earthquake, nor in the fire, in the spirit of Elijah when he slew the four hundred and fifty? I cannot say; I can only say that the Bible does not say that He was. It is impossible to know what would have followed, if Elijah had allowed the great miracle to remain in the minds of the Israelitish people unassociated with the slaughter of their former favourites. The descendants of the kindred of that people turned against a greater worker of miracles than Elijah, with less reason, a thousand years later; and the Israelites might, no doubt, when the shock of their sobriety had worn out, have returned to their vomit again. But at least the queen would not have had her pretext for driving the prophet into the wilderness.

Elijah's error, if I interpret it rightly, is not a warning against too much zeal; it is a warning against confounding political zeal with zeal for the Lord God of Hosts.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REFORM OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

SIR,—I am sorry not to be able to admire your editorial on the House of Lords. You propose to reform it "when calmer times return." If you allow this, the calmer times will never return, and you will have to reform it in a way you won't approve in the middle of a storm. What practical evil is there in the constitution of the House of Lords that it should be altered? Just now, and I hope during the winter coming, they are doing their duty in resisting an innovation dangerous in itself, and dangerous under the circumstances of our ignorance as to the effects of the innovation. If there is no practical reason for a change, that change will be made merely to indulge

the prevalent taste for mechanical symmetry, like the taste of a Dutchman who prunes down an oak into the shape of a loo-table. That House is constantly subject to a chronic reform; one fourth of the peers have been created in the present Queen's reign. The spirit of the age requires this and that, people say. The Spirit of the age be—something or other. It is not a dumb and deaf spirit, it is true; only deaf; deaf to reason, and to the Bible, and to the traditional voices of our forefathers. But dumb, not at all; it is very noisy, and says things that would have made former ages stare.

If you once begin to reform the House of Lords, you will not be able to stop till you have improved it off the face of the earth.

L.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—I regret very much that through press of business I am obliged to delay, I hope only for a few days, any attempt to proceed adequately with this discussion. Meantime, may I ask "F.T.P." to say whether he abandons or maintains the position with which he started the debate, viz., that the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" disproves the early date assigned to the Gospels? May I also ask why he calls the question, when our Gospels were written, my self-imposed question? Will he also please give me the references to Celsus and Aurelian for the word *παράλυτικός*? I have looked through an edition of Celsus (*De Medicina Libri Octo*), published at Rotterdam, 1750, and an edition of Aurelian (*Acutorum Morborum*, libri iii., *Chronicorum*, libri v.), published at Lausanne, 1774, and have failed to find the word. There is of course great hazard in a negative in such a case. I may have overlooked the word, though, both books being in Latin, Greek letters generally catch the eye; or the word may be a various reading, or there may perhaps be other works by these authors unknown to me. I do not attach much importance to this relatively to Luke's medical language, as *παράλυμένος* may very likely have been used by him simply as purer Greek than *παράλυτικός*, which, unless Celsus and Aurelian use it, seems to have no authority outside the Gospels, or books probably derived from them; but if there is an instance of the medical use of *παράλυτικός*, I ask that it be stated. Will "F.T.P." please notice that I ask his answer to three questions?

ERIGENA.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." October, 1884. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

THE *Expositor* is one of the few clerical magazines which never contain papers which are either childish or, what is far worse, unctuous. There are six articles in this month's issue—is not that rather too large a number for about eighty octavo pages of large print?—every one of them well worth reading. Four of them are continued from preceding articles, and of the other two, that by Mr. Edwin Johnson on "The Table of Demons" certainly throws light on the tenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and the other is a very interesting sermon by the

editor, Dr. Cox, on "Lot." Dean Plumtre continues his "Ideal Biography" of Ezekiel, and on the perplexing (as he rightly calls it) prophecy of Gog, is very interesting. He thinks that Ezekiel may have personally come in contact with some of the barbarian hosts of Scythians, and actually heard their threats. And he understands, with most moderns, "Gog the Prince of Rosh" to be a proper name; but he adds: "There is no fact in the history of the past that in any degree answers to this picture. I do not see any reason to anticipate a literal fulfilment of the prediction in the future. It can scarcely be questioned indeed that we are here in the region, not of prediction strictly so called, but of forecasts and anticipations." Mr. Deane's paper on the "Septuagint Additions to the Hebrew Text" is very interesting; but not so interesting as the Septuagint itself. Why is it that the average cleric knows no more about the Septuagint—the Bible, be it remembered, of our Saviour and His Apostles—than he does of Sanskrit? Does he think, with a hazy recollection of the VIth Article and the Council of Trent, that the Septuagint is Popish? Dr. Cox's sermon we have said is very interesting, but we still think that he who would defend the verdict of the author of the (so-called) second epistle of Peter, on "righteous Lot, that just man," has a difficult task.

THE Bishop of Lincoln has arrived at Harrogate on a three months' visit. His lordship's health is said to be somewhat improving.

THE Bishop of Liverpool preached from the pulpit of an Established Church when in Scotland, but Canon Bell, of Cheltenham, has actually been preaching in the Free Church at Braemar.—*Christian World*.

THE Rev. R. Arrowsmith, vicar of Stoke-with-Walsgrave-on-Sowe, has written to his parishioners that the serious illness which attacked him in April last has so far impaired his strength that he has resolved to resign his living.

THE Bishop of Rochester has returned to England after visiting the Bishop of Western New York at Buffalo, the Bishop of Iowa at Davenport, the Bishop of Minnesota at Faribault, the Bishop of Utah at Salt Lake City, Dean Hart at Denver, the Bishop of Pennsylvania at Wilks Barrè, and the Rev. Phillips Brooks at Boston. The Bishop also attended by invitation the annual Convention of the diocese of New York, held in New York City, under the presidency of Assistant-Bishop Potter, September, 23, 24.

THE provision of funds for the great repairs of Westminster Abbey is causing some difficulty (the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* says) to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The circumstances of the Session compelled the suppression of Mr. Gladstone's promised Bill for making special provisions for the maintenance of the fabric of such minsters and the cathedrals. But the principle of making such works a first charge upon Church estates is admitted by the Commissioners, and will perhaps be acted upon in advance of the legislation to be proposed next year.

THE Bishop of Manchester, in consecrating recently a new cemetery, spoke in strong approval of the Burials Act. He said he rejoiced that recent legislation had removed in relation to burials what had at

times caused unfriendly feelings between Church-people and members of other communions. The Burials Act, which was looked forward to by many Churchmen with so much dread and apprehension, had proved itself not only perfectly harmless to the true interests of the Church, but had helped to combine in one sentiment of citizenship in the kingdom of God those who, owing to circumstances of birth, tradition, or momentary irritation, had become members of different communities.

THE Bishop of Llandaff has again intimated to the new vicar, the Rev. Henry Law, who brought hither from London a few weeks since the Rev. Richard Hibbs, M.A., of St. John's, Cambridge, to assist him till Christmas, when the new curate is to come, that he, his lordship, refuses to allow Mr. Hibbs to carry out his engagement with Mr. Law. The latter thus writes to Mr. Hibbs:—"The Vicarage, Chepstow, October 6, 1884.—Dear Mr. Hibbs—The Bishop has again informed me that he cannot consent to your officiating in this diocese." Mr. Hibbs informs us that he will immediately appeal to the Primate.

THE lay-evangelists of the Lichfield Church Mission were assembled recently at Lichfield for three days of devotion and instruction under the direction of Prebendary Lester, the diocesan missionary. Each day began and ended with an intercessory prayer meeting, there being also a short meditation at mid-day in the Bishop's private chapel. Two instructions were given daily—one by the Bishop on the Apostles' Creed, and the other by Bishop Abraham on the first part of the Church Catechism. A course of Bible readings was also given on the Mission teachings of our Lord's miracles and parables by the diocesan missionary.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Rock* writes to that paper:—"There was a confirmation held a short time ago at Walsall. About thirty young persons connected with the Bott-lane Church Mission were being prepared, and attended the classes of a neighbouring clergyman, the Rev. F. G. Littlecot, vicar of St. Michael's, Rushall. The Bishop heard of it, and intimated to the clergyman that if the candidates were presented he would not admit them, because they did not attend the district church, St. Luke's, where Ritualism is being developed. Two clergymen (the Rev. F. G. Littlecot and the Rev. T. Reakes, vicar of Walsall Wood) waited on his Lordship to explain matters, but he would not be persuaded to comply. One of them said, 'But, my Lord, are not these young people being driven to dissent?' The Bishop's reply is said to have been, 'Let them go to dissent, and then we shall know where they are!' Next Sunday they all went to Communion, though not confirmed. The Bishop heard of it, and wrote to the clergyman, hoping the report was not true. The clergyman replied that it was quite true, and that he had admitted them to the Communion on the authority of of the rubric at the end of the Order of Confirmation, which says, 'And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.'"

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barthroppe, Rev. N. Shafto, Rector of Itton and Moun-ton; British Chaplain at St. Moritz, Engadine, for the winter months.

Burnett, Rev. Montagu, M.A., Vicar of All Saints'; Chaplain of the East London Sea-side Home, Southend.
Child, Rev. William Humphrey, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. James's, Plymouth.
Custance, Rev. Charles William Neville, Rector of Crowcombe, Somerset.
Dalton, Rev. A. E., Curate; Vicar of All Hallows', East India Docks.
Elton, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Sherrington, Bucks.
Field, Rev. Frederick Francis, B.A., Rector of Woughton-on-the-Green, Bucks.
Green, Rev. William Frederick, M.A., Vicar of East Budleigh.
Gregg, Rev. Edward Pease, M.A., Rector of Upton, Torquay, and Chaplain of Torquay Cemetery.
Groves, Rev. Charles Westley, Head Master of the Grammar-school, Risley; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Haynes, Rev. Edward Joseph, Vicar of Little Marlow, Bucks.
Hewson, Rev. F. S., Assistant-Curate of Alton; Vicar of Com-broke, Compton Verney, Warwickshire.
Heygate, Rev. William Augustine, M.A., Vicar of Leigh, Dorset.
Hood, Rev. E. P., Curate of All Saints', Babbacombe; Chaplain and Secretary to the British Seamen's Orphan Boys' Home, Brixham.
Jones, Rev. John W. Wynne, Rector of Lampeter Velfrey, Pembrokeshire; Vicar of Llanbeblig-with-Carnarvon.
Jones, Rev. Rees, Rector of Llansaintffraid Glyn-Dyfrdwy.
MacMichael, Rev. W. F., Curate-in-Charge, Mission Church of the Saviour, Luton.
Miles, Rev. L. V., British Chaplain at Lyons.
Moreton, Rev. Percy Dundas, Vicar of Pendeen, near Penzance.
Morgan, Rev. S. C., D.D., Vicar of Swansea; Vicar of St. Mary's, Leamington.
Parkhouse, Rev. William Heathman, M.A., Rector of St. Paul's, Exeter.
Peirce, Rev. David Davies, B.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Sarn.
Phillips, Rev. Samuel Henry, Curate-in-Charge of East and West Putford.
Pomeroy, Rev. Walter William, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Pratt, Rev. H. M., Rector of Great Whitcombe, Gloucestershire.
Purdue, Rev. G. H., Senior Curate of All Saints', Wokingham; Vicar of Shottermill, Surrey.
Rundell, Rev. W. J., late Curate-in-Charge of All Hallows', Barking; Vicar of Westmarsh, Kent.
Smith, Rev. A. F., Vicar of Bethersden, Kent; Vicar of Nack-ington, near Canterbury.
Smith, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Trinity Church, Nottingham; Vicar of Swansea.
Smyley, Rev. W., M.A., Chaplain of Trinity Church, Rome.
Taylor, Rev. Arthur W., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Kirby-Underdale, York; Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's Con-ventional District, St. John's, Farnworth-with-Kearsley.
Walrond, Rev. Prebendary, Vicar of Yatton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Arnold, Rev. Charles, Hon. Canon of Peterborough, and Rector of Tinwell for fifty-six years, at Tinwell Rectory, on the 2nd inst., aged 82.
Baker, Rev. John Norgrove, for thirty-four years Rector of How Caple-cum-Sollarshope, at How Caple Rectory, Ross, Herefordshire, on the 28th ult., aged 78.
Hooper, Rev. Charles John, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., at the Old Vicarage, Sparsholt, on the 30th ult.
Knox, Ven. Edmond Dalrymple Hesketh, late Archdeacon of Killaloe, at Abbey Road, St. John's Wood, on the 6th inst., aged 83.
Paget, Rev. Edward Heneage, formerly Vicar of Hoxne, Suffolk, at 70, Longridge Road, on the 29th ult., aged 56.
St. John, Rev. the Hon. Edmond Tudor, Rector of Bletsoe, at the Cottage, Melchbourne, suddenly, on the 30th ult., aged 36.
Wallace, Rev. Edwin, Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College, Oxford, at Davos Platz, on the 6th inst., aged 35.
Wardell, Rev. Henry, M.A., fifty-two years Rector of the parish, at Winlaton Rectory, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on the 4th inst., aged 84.



The Church of England Pulpit.

UNSELFISHNESS.

BY THE REV. CANON SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A.

PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL ON SUNDAY,
SEPTEMBER 21ST, 1884.

"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."—EPHESIANS iv. 31, 32.

WHAT a strange change it had been, that passage, to St. Paul's converts, out of the old into the new!—the old so rough, so angry, so violent and venomous, so loud and so brutal—the bad and ugly life into which St. Paul fears, in this morning's lesson, lest his Corinthians should be relapsing, as were his Galatians—that life woven out of such bitter threads and melancholy hues—"debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults"—that life of the flesh, "hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, envyings, murders." That it is, which has been banished and crucified by those who had found themselves, amid the heat and tumult of that loud quarrelling, suddenly mastered by the vision of Him who won them by His meekness and His gentleness—the Man of human kindness, the Priest of compassion, the King of Peace, the Lamb of God "who, when He was reviled, reviled not again." This was the message that had reached and held and possessed them, the message of the preacher who besought them by "the meekness and the gentleness" of Jesus. Ah! who can measure the sweetness with which such words would fall upon a world hot with angry feuds and bitter revenges—the meekness and the gentleness of Jesus? As cool water to fevered lips, as wet grasses amid arid sands, as the sound of soft rains falling on barren fields, so the kind words stole in upon them as a blessing and a boon to hearts worn and heavy laden, to those who had crept out of the tumult to hide their wounds and weariness amid the comfortable folds of that Good Shepherd who led them into such rich pastures, and by such quiet waters.

And yet we all of us are subject to a suspicion and a criticism that may be silent in church, but which will yet rejoin us at the church door, and before we reach home will have had their say—a suspicion very old and very familiar, but, for all that, one which it may be well worth while to

consider again. It suggests that possibly something, after all, may have been lost in the passage from the old state to the new. Very rough, very uncomfortable that old condition of things may have been; but was there not a vigour in its vivacities and a robustness in its violence that we miss in the kindly new? Is there no loss of manliness in passing to this new temper? and is it fitted for the actual world? We know rough work needs rough methods; and our work here is rough, and cannot be pushed through without a good deal of emphatic energy. And, again, there is a hearty and muscular naturalness in that boisterous scramble of man against man, which we like in books and in plays, even though in real life it is rather oppressive and unpleasant. And this humility, this gentleness,—they disturb us as something unnatural, artificial, laboured. Are they quite real? Are they not apt to be very full of provoking mannerisms and insincerities? So every one, I suppose, has said to himself again and again; and with this suspicion at work within him he easily accepts the more formal and public criticism which is familiar in our ears, pronouncing that these Christian graces, beautiful as ideals, charming us as spiritual excellencies with their choice flavour of exquisite piety, do nevertheless represent an unearthly and unsocial type of virtue; that we lose as citizens what we gain as saints; that by walking in the Spirit we cease to be equally effective forces for economic purposes; that the business of a State would prefer in its factors the old character at the cost of its quarrelsome, to the new at the price of its passivity.

Now this suspicion and this criticism are familiar and strong because they have a great deal of plausible evidence behind them. There is much in our religious habit and temper which would tend to confirm what they suggest, and certainly our religious thought has failed to give us any logic which would displace the suspicion or expose the criticism; and through this we are easily led into three great disasters.

First, there have been bred up among us that public mind and tone which have so deeply accepted these assumptions of which I speak that it has been found easy for science to persuade us that wherever the root-instincts of men are allowed free play they are necessarily selfish; that from this primal and calculable motive all the vigorous and positive qualities of industrious production issue; that the degree of vigour so displayed will be in proportion to the amount of selfishness in action; and that, however much this natural impulse may and ought, for ethical reasons, to be checked and limited, yet such checks and limitations will curtail the normal action of commercial industry according to the degree with which they repress the free play of self-interest. That is a well-known position which we have allowed to pass, and in which we have detected no flaw.

Perhaps its careful abstention from the moral region would put us off our guard.

But then there comes the second disaster, that when the parallel position is taken in that region of ethics we seem to have lost our power of protest. Who does not know how naturally, how obviously the argument meets us? Who can resist its patent evidence, its plain and plausible logic? Our eyes are taught to range over the turmoil of a swarming and warring life of nature; and everywhere we learn how all things push forward to self-preservation, towards fuller living—how upwards towards this richer existence everything presses, and thrusts, and aspires, and that in that vital vigour lies the secret of all type and growth and transformation. And when we pass from the lower level, without any perceptible break, into the long strife of human progress, surely it is the same law, that we cannot but detect, directing and ruling the advance—the law of preservation, the methods of self-interest. Men struggle to endure in order to grow, and the principles which best serve that endurance and that growth they call Ethics; and, since all advance must issue out of this passion of self-interest, Ethics have inevitably their justification in a wise and skilful selfishness. This we hear, and religious and serious people, though they do not like the sound of it, practically abstain from denying it, and at last doubt whether it can be denied.

And there follows a third disaster—they are driven to suppose that heroes and saints, who use very different language, have in reality, unknown to themselves, this very motive at work which they most violently repudiate. They fancy, these saints, that they are losing their all for Christ, while in reality that is impossible; no such vigorous action as they put forth could be produced by anything short of self-interest; they, too, must be, in the end, in pursuit of their own happiness. They do not think so, because they ask for no happiness on earth, but that is only because they have caught sight of the richer blessing to be theirs hereafter. It may be true that all ethical systems repudiate this self-interest, but they can only mean to repudiate the lower and lesser in view of the higher and the better; for all Ethics must be bound to assume that man, in acting, seeks his own perfection and happiness, and is, therefore, in a high sense selfish.

Now that, you will say, is philosophy, and none of us here may be philosophers; we cannot therefore travel into the discussions by which such a problem will be finally solved. But one thing we all can do, and one thing is very urgent that we should do, and that is, that we should try to make out what it is we mean by selfishness, and what by unselfishness; for it is this word "selfish" that, after all, is the difficulty. Are we at all right or rational, let us ask ourselves, when we assume that all action which vigorously

advances the fortunes of the agent is for that reason to be called selfish? We have allowed these theories, and allowed ourselves to assume this. But why? Why should we make such an assumption? What evidence is there that vigorous pursuit of personal good proceeds out of selfish motives? Surely St. Paul, the preacher of meekness and gentleness in Jesus—surely he is rather a hard instance to bring under our assumption. No one, I suppose, pretends to doubt the genuineness of the Apostle's self-surrender. Unselfishness, as we know, was with him a passion—the master passion of his life. But is there, then, in him none of that vigorous vitality which works ever upward and onward? Is there, then, no assertion of the fullest personal energies? Were his cravings unchallenged, were his passions untaxed, was his character typically one of repression, of curtailment, of subdual? Was his self—that which lies at the heart of self—that which is Paul—was *that* ineffectual and passive? Was there in him no burning curiosity, no pertinacious aspiration, no splendid ambition, no striving after perfection? Had he, then, no purposed and chosen prizes set before him for which he hungered, and in the hope of which he endured? How his own words leap to our memories to answer our questions! Always he ranks himself with those who stand as types of strenuous life. He was as an athlete bent on a prize; he was as a runner with his eyes set on a far goal, who, with muscles strung and fibre tried and trained, summons out all *that* is in him, puts out the gathered forces and bends all his issuing and springing energies upon the hope set before him, towards which he ever presses—presses towards the high mark of his calling, not regarding those things which are behind, "counting all as dung," that he may win Christ, that he may wear the crown laid up in heaven for him who runs a good course here on earth. This eager, passionate, burning pursuit of the perfect manhood, of that excellency in Christ Jesus into which he desires to grow—this, looked at from without, is surely identical in appearance with that impetuous craving which pushes all men forward towards their highest interest, and which we, therefore, assume to be inherently selfish. If, as spectators, we were asked to describe that vigorous assertion of a vital self which is the root-impulse of all natural life, what words should we choose, what words should we prefer to those which speak of "forgetting the things which are behind," of "reaching forward to the things which are before" us, of pressing towards a high mark—towards some secret perfection? And yet all this in the apostle proceeds out of the very heart and heat of his *unselfishness*.

Evidently we have been too vague in our generalisations; we have classed with selfishness what may very well belong to unselfishness; we have assumed that all movement

towards the better life has self-gratification for its final motive; that all vigorous assertion of personal life proceeds out of selfish greed. But the truth is that Christianity denies that assumption, and challenges it all along the line. This pursuit of the higher life need not be, in any sense or degree, necessarily selfish. It may be selfish; but it is just as possible that it is wholly the other. And, more, in all its most energetic and effectual types it is sure to be unselfish, for selfishness is never, as a practical fact, able to kindle into life the more fervent and daring forms of self-assertion. The selfish man seeks his own good after all, but very sluggishly; it is the unselfish apostle who pursues it with the zeal of a martyr and the passion of a saint.

Let us attempt to make this clearer. What exactly does it mean to say that one's own good is selfishly sought? It is not selfishly sought *because* it is one's own good. It is selfishly sought only when it is desired for the sake of the gratification it brings, for the sake of the honour and pleasure and gain it may reflect upon its possessor—that is, when it is not sought for its own sake, but only for the sake of what it brings after it. Success is selfish, when it is craved not simply as successful action, successful attainment, but because of the feeling of pleasure, which is not success itself, but is that which accompanies success—that feeling which we know, that gratified vanity, which glows and warms within us as we watch over our own success, as we reflect on it, as we recall it, as we retail it to others, as we pride ourselves upon it, as we croon over it. We may often hunger for success *in order to* feed this feeling, and then success, no doubt, is selfishly desired. But must it be for this for which we desire success? Have we always this after-feeling in view? Is there no such thing as desire for success simply as success, without a single momentary thought of its reflex action which will follow upon ourselves? Why, the whole history of man and the whole sum of experience are loud with the answer. Take any workman, take any artist—what is the secret of their inspiration? What is the key to all their highest work? Surely nothing but the work, the love of the work, the love of good work as such, the desire to see the effort of labour issue in the finest result. That is their end; that is their motive. Good work satisfies them as good work. It is a continual fascination that draws them forward at all costs and at all risks to themselves through austere discipline, through long hours of weary disappointment, through hunger, and cold, and nakedness; and they ask no questions why; they would be wounded and stung as with a whip if you hinted it was because of some after pleasure to themselves. They are happy, no doubt, in their work—that is they cannot help being; but to think much of that happiness is, they know well, to ruin their

work; it saps their zeal, it undermines their skill. And it cannot be that they are deceived, that they have beguiled themselves into a condition of self-deceit in which they cannot distinguish what is selfish from what is unselfish; for vanity, selfishness, self-love, the sucking of the grapes of gratification—these are all passions still in them which they know quite well by experience, for every day they feel them mingling with all their inspirations. But that which they so feel and know they know also to be utterly distinct from the inspiration which makes them artists, and they know also that the further such motives as those extend, the less genuine is their artistic work; and if those motives altogether prevailed they would cease altogether to be artists. No man has ever produced the highest artistic work for the sake of the pleasure it brought him; such an aim inevitably drains the life blood out of his heart. And in business and in all employments the same impulse tells. That is the best workman in all employments who works for the sake of the work—the banker who has forgotten what he can gain by being richer, but who has the keen zest of a sportsman for following up a scheme, and the fascination of an artist in the handling of his funds. And in everything work would be at a standstill if there were not in vigorous action, something more than the motive of gain,—the delight in the result being produced in the best possible way and on the best possible lines; and wherever, throughout a country, this artistic motive in work languishes, there the productions deteriorate and the trade must fall. That is the verdict of a world-wide experience, and Christianity seizes on it in its primary truth. Did you lightly suppose that there was no motive but self-interest that roused men to the pursuit of their own good? Christianity frankly, yet firmly, says exactly the opposite. When has selfishness ever spurred men to heroic audacities, or lifted them into splendid action? How often has selfishness won any ardent and eager disciple? A great mass of very commonplace and ordinary activity can be accounted for by it. When we have no strong motive working upon us, then it is that we fall back on self-interest; when we are indifferent, undetermined, idle, then it is that we set to work to calculate which course will please us most, or by which path we shall win most gain. Selfishness is the dull drudge that sweeps the house, that does a good deal of plain and obscure and plodding work for us; it has sufficient force to carry us along through commonplace matters, where we need no special effort. But whenever we are really roused, or alive, or strenuous, or enkindled, then we throw the calculations of selfishness to the winds, we laugh at the question of our gains, and forget to ask what will come of it all; we feel only the keen craving that at any cost our cause should win; we throw ourselves into it, we give ourselves to it just as

runners who yield themselves up to the passion of a race, and run as if there were nothing in all the wide world to be done but just to run and to win, without ever dreaming of asking the why or the wherefore.

Nor is it only the joy of the artist that is the seed of vigorous action; there is another motive, even more powerful, more universal, and more fruitful—the motive of love. A man will do far more for the love of others than he ever will do for himself; he will display a finer vigour, a nobler patience, a steadier courage, a fuller energy on behalf of mother, and home, and wife, and children, by the side of which the efforts he will make on behalf of his own interests will look but poor and thin. Nor is it only others that he helps by doing this; it is himself who is vitalised by the new hope; it is his own being that is enlarged and enriched—his own interest and good and perfection that he attains through this devotion to another. He is made a better man by loving. We have all seen it. A young man without responsibilities, left to himself, with nothing but his own interest to serve, how idle, how profitless he is! how meagre! how sluggish! His powers lie all dulled through and through with indifference; he hangs about life listless, unquickened, bored, fatigued. Even though all his future prospects depend on his industry, he cannot be got to put himself under pressure; no calls, no reproaches, no warnings, will induce him to put his energies out in action; he is selfish, and because he is selfish he is idle. But how he has surprised us when the touch of love has laid his hand upon him. For, lo! he is a new being, his manhood stirs, his will quickens, his senses are all alert. Night and day he schemes how he may win prosperity; he toils with perseverance, he endures with a valiant cheerfulness of which no one believed him capable; for the sake of that other he will slave as he never slaved for himself; and all through the long days that follow, as he thinks of her in the house with the children, he will set himself to the grim task of life with an ardour that would have died out and been beaten years before, if it had been but his own poor, pitiful self for which he was spending his strength. And do you retort that such love is, after all, but a piece of indirect selfishness, that it is for his own joy that he works when he works on behalf of his wife and his home? Then, if so, why is indirect selfishness so much more vigorous than selfishness when it is direct? A motive, if it is the animating motive, must surely be most effective when it is most visible, most distinctly present. How is it that selfishness is so far more powerful when it conceals itself in the love for another and pretends to be unselfish? Surely we are playing with words when we reduce life to such a game of pretence, to a mad charade in which motives only move by dressing themselves up in disguises of their opposites. Love, as a fact, moves by charming a man

into self-forgetfulness, by absorbing him in devotion to another; and through this, and this alone, it obtains its motive power. If a man could persuade himself that in loving another he were really loving himself, why, his very love would perish at the discovery.

Self rouses itself, then, into vigorous activity only when it is in the service of another than itself, most of all when it loves; and if love could be raised to the highest power, then the vigour and vitality of that personal self would be at the very height of their fulness; to be given the power of loving would be to be given the power of living. And therefore our creed woke a dying world into new life by bringing to bear upon its stiffening limbs and chilled heart the invocation of a God whom it could love. It was dying, that old world, and dying of selfishness; but it woke under the presence of a Lord and Master to whose graciousness and to whose beauty it could offer the enkindling honour of an unselfish service and the glory of an unending self-surrender. It was aroused to do for Him what it had not the spirit to do for itself. The weariness of self-service, the melancholy of self-love—they fled away like a cloud before the hope of an eternal devotion to the name of Jesus Christ; and, instead of the tired, dispirited Pharisee, sick to death of self-service under the law of works, you have the great Apostle of the Gentiles, illumined, radiant, transformed, endowed with power upon power, energy upon energy, gift upon gift, "in labours more abundant, in strifes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in death oft." Active, strong, inexhaustible, he now finds store upon store of treasure within his soul, once so dry and so bare. "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended, and I burn not?"

Selfishness is bound to flag. It brings upon us poverty of blood, loss of heart, drained vitality, a sunken, fagged, and burdened life. Is it not at the root of so much in us that is dispirited and disheartened, and fretful, and listless? You meet men and women who drag themselves along, who are dim with sheer indifference, who find no light and no joy in all that this world can bring them.

My brethren, when this humour creeps over us, let us closely examine and see whether it be not some self-seeking that has brought it upon us; for life will look sordid and meagre and meaningless, after a time, to a man of selfishness. He feels it profoundly stale and unprofitable; he realises so little, and there is so little that is worth the cost of realising. The aim is mean, and it is impossible to be energetic for long in serving its claims. But love, love for others—this enriches, this enkindles, this evokes in us the desire to be better men; it sustains us in the effort of self-improvement. Love fulfils the law. Everything becomes possible to those who love. The commands of the Lord are no longer grievous, for the soul that loves is

gifted by that love with fresh energies ; it discovers in itself unsuspected possibilities, and is supplied with ever-flowing currents of new vigour. The impossible becomes possible to all who look to another and love, the hard loses its hardness, and the grievous ceases from grieving. Love enlightens, and warms, and cheers, and renews, and again and again the self within us presses forward under its sweet breath toward the hope set before us.

Unselfishness is the only salt that preserves our soundness ; unselfishness is the only fire that purifies, and refines, and betters, and makes perfect. We shall be enabled to do so much if only we love. We live by loving, and the more we love the more we live ; and therefore, when life feels dull and the spirits are low, turn and love God, love your neighbour, and you will be healed of your wounds. Love Christ, the dear Master, look at His face, listen to His words, and love will waken, and you will do all things through Christ who strengtheneth you.

ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL.

BY THE REV. HENRY THOMPSON, B.A., VICAR OF ALDEBURGH, SUFFOLK, LATE SCHOLAR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SERMON PREACHED AT ALDEBURGH, ON THE ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, 1884.

"Therefore, whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."—I COR. xv. 11.

THUS ends the passage which forms our epistle for to-day. We propose to glance over the whole eleven verses, seeking lessons from them. We may conveniently do so under the heads "I," "Ye," "So ;" the Preacher, the Hearers, and the Gospel.

And (1) The Preacher. Who is this who classes himself with the Twelve, and says — "I or they, so we preach" ?

Confining ourselves to the passage before us, we get two answers. (a.) A persecutor ; a former persecutor ; he once destroyed the faith which now he preached : "I persecuted the Church of God." Indeed he did. His zeal outran that of all. Awful as is the picture drawn in the history, we should pay attention to his own references to his mad career, if we would get the true idea of what he was. "I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women. I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed. When they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme. Being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities. Beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and wasted it." Here is a picture indeed ! The scourgings, the prisons, the deaths,

the unhappy blasphemers, the cities of the Holy Land not sufficient for the waster's zeal. And with it all we can never forget that Saul was conscientious in what he did. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." How imperfect a grasp of God's law may a conscientious man have ! How earnestly should we ask Christ to take this natural instinct and instruct it by His Spirit ! This, however, by the way. Here the writer is dwelling on the marvellous fact that he "who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious," was now (b) An Apostle. "Not meet to be called an Apostle," because of his past history ; "the least of the Apostles ;" but still, by the grace of God, what he was. Nothing is said here of his conversion, because apostleship is the point ; he was one of the chosen witnesses of the Resurrection, he is saying. Our Church so wisely calls St. Paul's Day, "The Conversion of St. Paul." Only thus in his case, because his conversion was so "wonderful" even among conversions. But here the call to the apostolate is the point. The persecutor an Apostle ! In that office he was both least and greatest. Least as regards his deserts. In him the chief of sinners was saved and put into the ministry. He was an abortive : not regularly born into the apostleship as the twelve were, but in a violent and untimely manner. And, as an untimely child is more diminutive and feeble than the others, so in his own opinion of himself he was the least of the Apostles, and yet in labours the greatest. God's grace bestowed on him was not in vain, but he laboured more abundantly than all the Twelve. The passage (2 Cor. xi.) in which his converts compel him to "speak as a fool," opens our eyes wonderfully to the fact that as we read his labours in the Acts the half is not told us. The zeal which persecuted now laboured in the Lord. The truth may be spoken, but it is of that seemingly boastful nature that in a moment he puts another face on it ; "yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." Grace saved ; grace gave apostleship ; grace enabled him to labour as he did. When the headstone of his extraordinary life should be brought forth, it could be only with shoutings of "Grace, grace" unto it.

But (2) The hearers. Among the labours of his second great missionary journey were nearly two years' labours at the famous, wealthy, and wicked city of Corinth, the capital of Southern Greece. And God had much people there. In Christ Jesus the Apostle begat them through the Gospel. He had not yet visited them a second time, but was writing to them from Ephesus on his third journey. What does he say to them ? (a.) "Ye believed," he says ; and again, "ye received the gospel which I preached unto you." Yes, "many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptised." There is conversion. The

word of Jesus Christ is heard *and received*; heard *and believed*. Those who hear do the things which they are called upon to do in God's Name, they turn to the Lord Jesus to save them from their sins. How well we do to pray in the prayer for the Church Militant that the congregation may *hear and receive* God's Holy Word with meek heart and due reverence! "These are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word and receive it." (b.) "Ye stand," he says further. So in writing to the Romans he speaks of "this grace wherein ye stand." To those that are justified by faith there is a first gift of "peace with God;" then there is a permanent standing in the favour of God which the justified enjoy. The first turning to the Lord which is described by "ye believed," can be done but once, but the standing by faith is continuous; from moment to moment we live by the faith of the Son of God. (c.) Again he says of them, "Ye are being saved." So the Greek. And it is very important to notice the tense. Compare Acts ii. 47 (New Version), "The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved." Men ask us nowadays, "Are you saved?" And we answer, perhaps, "I hope so." And the rejoinder is "Hoping will not do; you are either saved or not." But is it a right use of the word? If you must question me, ask me if I have believed, and I will humbly answer, "Yes." But, if you insist on my adopting a word which ignores all the good fight of faith and the salvation to be wrought out in fear and trembling, I prefer to answer in the language of Holy Scripture, "I am being saved," and in the old-fashioned language of the Scriptural Prayer-book, "I heartily thank our Heavenly Father that He hath called me to this state of salvation through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me His grace that I may continue in the same unto my life's end." (d.) He says yet one thing more of His Corinthian converts, which is the gist of the passage, and a sad thing. Strictly it follows our text, but the passage before us implies it and is all preparatory to it. In spite of all that God had done and was doing in them, some among them were saying that there was not resurrection of the dead; *i.e.*, they did not deny the immortality of the soul, but explained away the Divine sayings which had declared the resurrection of the body, and gave them a mere spiritual meaning, saying that the Resurrection was past already (2 Tim. ii. 18), in the new birth of the Christian soul. In a word, they confounded the first Resurrection, that of the soul, with the second Resurrection, that of the body, (Wordsworth)—denying, you will see, one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ! (Heb. vi. 2). And that so soon! Perhaps we do not give enough thought to that which this great Apostle names last among his trials—"the care of all the Churches." The speedy declension and wanderings

of many of his converts must have almost broken his heart. It was not three years since he left Corinth, and here they were (like the Galatians just after) "so soon removed from him that called them into the grace of Christ unto another Gospel!"

(3.) And so it is that he is led, and we are following him, to remind the Corinthian Christians of the Gospel which he had preached and they believed—what it was. If we have thought upon St. Paul and the Corinthians, now we think upon Christ; it is a Gospel of Christ. What then of Him? Three things. (a.) His death. "Christ died for our sins," the Apostle says. Do not let us diminish the blessed force of the words, "in our stead." On account of our sins, it is true, in order to take them away, and so save us from their penalty—death. But also in our place. The Greek preposition is the same in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, "One died for all," "He died for all," and in 1 Tim. ii. 6, "Who gave Himself a ransom for all." And this, he says, was "according to the Scriptures." He was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and in the Scriptures of the Old Testament God had caused it to be written long before. (b.) His burial. Very important as an article of faith. The Evangelists, not relating other things which perhaps we might have expected they would, *all* supply an account of Christ's burial. Why? Because it was a great and very substantial part of the evidence both of His being dead and of His rising again. (c.) The last fact is that rising again; "He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." "The Scriptures" once more. He will speak of the testimony of those who saw the Lord after His Resurrection, but let them not forget the testimony of the Scriptures, "which cannot be broken." A tense deserves to be noticed here again: "and that He *hath been raised*." He *was* buried; His burial was once for all, and transitory. He *hath been* raised; the permanency of the *risen* body of Christ is marked. Jesus our Lord is alive for evermore. The enumeration of the appearances of the risen Lord seems out of all proportion to the former part of this "Gospel," till we remember what was amiss at Corinth; some were denying the Resurrection. "But if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." The two are inseparably joined, the Head and the members stand on the same footing. But is it so that all they are *false* witnesses of God who have testified that He raised up Christ? So he proceeds to enumerate the appearances; and the beautiful instructive digression in verses 9 and 10, arises out of the mention of himself as last of all permitted to see the Lord in His glorified body.

We look at this Gospel and note two things,

1. It is a Gospel of facts. If the Death, Burial, Resurrection are not historical facts, the whole thing is gone. Here is no system of theories argued from premises. Here is doctrine based on

history. Here is a claim made on our allegiance for a Person, not on our credence for a dogma.

2. And they are simple facts for the simple. Of course it is not to be expected of the unlettered that they should satisfy themselves of the historical evidence of the Resurrection of Christ. This would be to shut them out of the Kingdom of Heaven. Enough for them that the Church of Christ, which they see and know, has been built upon that crowning miracle as the evidence was handed on from age to age and land to land. And if they believe the death for sin, the burial, the rising of the Son of God, they have the witness in themselves.

Christian brethren, hold fast this Gospel. To you the Apostle speaks. Amid all these distressing denials, of which we hear so much, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, "forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." The deniers of the Resurrection would make it so, but it shall not be without its reward "in that day."

And let all embrace it. We cannot hold fast till we have embraced. Alas that it is so possible to hear and not receive, to listen and not take home! What is needed by many? An act of personal appropriation of this great salvation—

Jesus, I will trust Thee, trust Thee with my soul,
Guilty, lost, and helpless, Thou canst make me whole.
There is none in heaven or on earth like Thee;
Thou hast died for sinners, therefore, Lord, for me.

THE Bishop of London, who had been spending some weeks at Staunton, near Monmouth, came to Gloucester on Saturday week, accompanied by Miss Jackson, on a visit to Canon and Mrs. Harvey. The Bishop preached at morning service in the cathedral on Sunday. The Mayor and Corporation attended in state, and there was a large congregation. The Bishop was also present at the afternoon service.

HOUSING OF THE POOR.—Presiding at a Diocesan Conference at Leicester, on Tuesday, the Bishop of Peterborough alluded to the question of housing the poor, which he said was closely connected with social purity. It was idle to expect men to lead lives of Christians if they had homes of brutes. How they were to remedy the evil of ill-housing of the poor was one part of the question. The subject, he was glad, had occupied the attention of the Legislature, and the State might usefully, within certain limits, help in the elucidation of the difficulty; but outside these limits State aid would be dangerous. He did not expect much amelioration of the state of the poor from the State's action. If in London the State provided dwellings for the labouring classes, more harm would be done to them than to the rich, because people would crowd to those parts where houses were good, and this fact, with inevitable increase of rates, would lead to lower wages, and to a more grinding competition among labourers. It was more the work for the Church than the State. They should make the people discontented with the filth surrounding them, and lead them to improve their dwellings by their own power.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months 5s. 6d. twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1884.

LAY MINISTRATIONS.

THE question of lay work is one which is being discussed with unwonted vigour at the present time. We have seen various organisations set on foot at different times with the object of regulating and stimulating it, notably the London Lay Helpers' Association, which has been in existence for some years, while in other parts of the country laymen are employed as Scripture readers, or deacons. In the diocese of Lichfield the late Bishop Selwyn formulated a plan by means of which a young man, after working for some two years or more in some parish, under the direction of the vicar or rector, and after passing two examinations in each year, was allowed, after spending three terms at the Theological College, to present himself as a candidate for holy orders. But the great point to which the attention of churchmen is being directed is the plan proposed by the present Bishop of Lichfield, viz., that a layman holding the Bishop's licence shall be allowed to hold a service in the parish church at such times as it is possible to get the people together, and to supplement in this way the ordinary services of the Church, that is to say, to have a Mission Service in the church at eight o'clock on Sunday evening after the ordinary evening service is over. This proposal was defeated at the recent meeting of the Southern Convocation, and whether it will eventually succeed time alone will prove. Meanwhile the debate on lay work at the Carlisle Congress has demonstrated very clearly that lay help is sorely needed at the present time, and it has also shown that the Church has earnest sons who are willing to take an active part in Church work. The only thing is that this work should be properly recognised by those in authority. Bishop

Bromby, who has seen a great deal of the world, having been for some years Bishop of Tasmania, and being now rector of a parish in Shropshire, and Coadjutor to the Bishop of Lichfield, boldly advocated the plan proposed by his chief, while on the other hand the Dean of Lichfield was in favour of lay help being confined to mission rooms. We admit that there is a danger in opening our churches for the services of laymen, and it is a measure which needs most careful consideration; but if a layman—not one who merely uses this office as a stepping-stone to the higher orders in the Church, but one of whose good life and conversation there is no doubt—can hold a service in a mission church, which may to all intentions and purposes be a church only wanting consecration, we do not see any great harm in his saying a few prayers, reading a chapter, and giving an address at the lectern as a mission service in the parish church, after the ordinary service is over. It may be argued with some degree of truth that, once set the ball rolling, we cannot tell where it will stop; but the Bishop has the power of revoking the licence of any layman of whose conduct or usurped pretensions there may be a doubt. A very great deal depends upon the men who undertake the work, and upon the fitness of the men. The Bishops and their chaplains, must use the utmost care. Far better to hold back all lay work for a time than that those who are unlearned and inexperienced should be allowed to undertake a work for which they are manifestly unfit. We notice at the recent meeting of the Peterborough Diocesan Conference, where this subject among others was discussed, that a layman holding the Bishop's licence made the following remarks:—The first danger he foresaw from admitting laymen to minister in the churches was that they might in time lose sight of order and discipline, and another great fear was that it would lead to the undermining or bringing into contempt the grace of orders. Then he thought there was a danger of breaking down the value of ordination; and for a remedy for the present state of things he would first revive the Minor Orders. The dangers are here clearly set forth, and they are the rocks ahead which must be carefully considered; but we imagine that if people are rightly taught, there will not be that breaking-down of the value of ordination; the poorest person generally can tell the difference between the clergyman and the layman. Also we may refer to the Wesleyans, there is no community which uses lay help more than they do. Yet there is the distinction between the minister and the local preacher. We have no wish to see Churchmen imitate Dissent in any way, for the Church has plenty of power in herself to provide for the present distress without copying others; or, as the Bishop of Peterborough so plainly put it, they should not be in too great a hurry to adopt this or that plan which they found working well in

other communities, for what might work well with others might not be suitable for us. Nor yet must we lose sight of the same prelate's wise words, that the priestly and pastoral functions belonged to the ordained minister, the evangelical and diaconal functions in a large measure to laymen; and also that if the clergy were the right arm of the Church, the laity were the left arm. Unfortunately one of those arms, the laity, had been too long tied up, and had become cramped and stiffened in consequence. That lay help is most valuable is admitted by all, and the question is, Shall they be allowed to conduct mission services in the Church, or shall they be relegated to mission rooms? With regard to mission rooms, of which so many speak with so much complacency, we wonder whether they have any conception what many of the modern so-called mission rooms are. In some cases they are iron churches, which are so hot in summer as to be almost unbearable, while in the winter they are so cold that they are with difficulty properly warmed. Sometimes they are schoolrooms with maps hung round on the walls, with hard, bare, uncomfortable seats, no provision for kneeling, and not at all attractive. If mission rooms are made comfortable, then people may be induced to attend, and their comfort must be considered. A warm, well-lighted building will often "draw;" and it may be, that in the absence of these it has been thought desirable to open the parish church, which is the common heritage of all parishioners rich and poor alike. We trust that some scheme will be sanctioned whereby the ministrations of the laity will be recognised, and also that there will not be that jealousy between the vicar and his lay-helpers, which is so injurious to all work for God, and which the President of the Church of England Working Men's Society referred to some time ago. The ministrations of the laity are of almost priceless value, and if used and directed aright may be productive of much real and lasting good.

THE CHURCH AND THE DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

WE heartily commend the Rev. J. M. Wilson's Paper on this subject, printed on another page, to the careful study of our readers. It enunciates, as we think, the truest and most practical version of Christianity, and indicates in clear and forcible language how the Church ought to execute the *new* commandment of her Lord, and not to repudiate in deed, though not in word, His Gospel of good works. It vindicates the views we have so often expressed, that mediæval and modern Christianity does not adequately exhibit the spirit of brotherhood and love and respect for humanity that breathes in the life and words of Christ; that moral conditions are, as Christ taught, in a very high degree dependent on physical conditions, and

that "a low and immoral type of human being is produced (by hereditary disease) in the dens of our cities;" that our Saviour ploughed the ground before He sowed the seed, and was, like Moses, a *sanitary* before He was a moral reformer. We approve the principles Mr. Wilson lays down for the Church's action for improving the dwellings of the poorest classes, and hope, as we wrote on the 20th ult., that the Church will go farther and deeper in a sanitary direction. As regards the so-called "rookeries" of London and other large towns, we have indicated in previous articles that the only way of permanently improving them is to reform the "rooks" themselves, and this can best be done by regulating and restricting the enormous amount of injurious, immoral, and obstructive street-trading at present carried on in the public thoroughfares. Every kind of food, clothing, and merchandise, except wine, beer, and spirits, is now hawked about and sold in the streets of London.

THE LOSS OF EDEN.

(Communicated.)

(Continued from page 80.)

SOME of my friends who have read the short paper on "The Loss of Eden" in THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT of the 16th August, have asked me why I assume so confidently that the third chapter of Genesis contains an allegory; why I do not accept the "literal" meaning of it, as they express it. I can only reply to this, that I think the way in which I regard it is the "literal" way. I find that the expressions "Tree of Life" and "Tree of Knowledge" are terms such as are likely to be applied, according to the accustomed use of language, not to trees like oaks and elms, but to emblems. I find also that the expulsion of the first married pair from the Garden must be, and therefore is to be taken as, an interdiction from some spiritual or moral possession, not from an estate; for that there is no part of our globe, the frozen regions and the summits of the Himalayas excepted, which the human race is debarred access to in practice; and imagination cannot place Eden in any of those localities. If, accordingly, one essential part of the history is allegorical (I object to the word *mythical*, and shall not employ it, although I can bring no overwhelming reasons against it), the rest is also. Because a history, dancing from romance to fact, and from fact back to romance, is not a history at all. But a history that is all fact is a history. And a history that is all allegory may be amongst the truest histories that ever were written, as the popular appreciation of the "Pilgrim's Progress" proves. There is more than this.

The denunciation "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" indicates a figurative, or allegorical intimation. If the tree of knowledge was a tree like an oak, or a pear-tree, this meant no more than that its fruit was poison, and would straightway destroy life—animal life. But the disobedient children (children they were in years, though perfect in physical development) did not die on the day they ate the fruit; they lived for many years, yea centuries afterwards. Therefore the death which they

incurred was not a physical death, nor was it the liability to a physical mortality; for the threat was fulfilled by their instant reduction to an inferior moral condition when their eyes were opened. They experienced a death unto righteousness. Thus, the effects of the eating of the fruit are expressed figuratively; therefore the eating of the fruit is itself a figurative description of their sin.

If it be said that man was created immortal, and that the eating of the fruit made him mortal, I answer that this "literal" interpretation of the chapter is inconsistent with the reason given why God banished the man and the woman from the Garden. They were banished to prevent them from acquiring immortality by eating the fruit of the Tree of Life. So that they were not immortal before.

Man is an animal, and there is not an expression in the Book of Genesis to make us suppose that he was an animal under different conditions from other animals, in their merely animal relations; except it be thought—incorrectly I submit—that when God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul, he was given faculties beyond those with which the animal world in general was endowed, *in this respect*. But I hold, on the contrary, that man was then given faculties of a spiritual nature and effect, differentiating him from the beasts, not in degree but in kind; and that these faculties are above, not merely parallel to, the vital functions which he has in common with the lower creation.

There was no prohibition to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Life, but the first human beings did not eat of it. How is this to be accounted for? I conjecture, because it was not attractive. The woman saw that the fruit of the other tree was good for food; nothing is said of the desirableness of the fruit of the better tree, as we now know, and as she and her husband were told plainly enough, that it was. And this undervaluing of the best of all the gifts of God—spiritual, or as it is called in the New Testament—eternal, life, characterises not the first generation only, but all generations. That gift is, to speak vulgarly, too good for us. We are not to have it restored in its fulness till we see the Living Tree growing and bearing its fruit in that paradise, wherein righteousness shall dwell and reign.

The Tree of Knowledge drops out of history and out of sight. Its fruit has been partaken of. Some say that the "Fall of Man" was a step in human progress and human development. I will not enter on this, for I cannot. What the human race would have been, had things turned out otherwise, is a speculation not encouraged in the Bible. But whether the conjecture, which I do not feel myself either able to discuss, or justified in discussing, is a correct one or not, we may be certain that God has turned the disobedience of His creatures unto His own praise and glory. Not in this instance only has He done so. He always and ever makes the wrath of man to praise Him. Through the means of the selfish calculations of Herod, of the weakness of Pilate, of the fury of the Pharisees, of the malice of the Sadducees, of the madness of the populace of Jerusalem, and of the treachery of Judas, He caused to be accomplished the Great Atonement, and so the reconciliation of mankind to Himself. How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!

The "literal" method of seeking to understand the Scriptures is the true method. Words mean much; otherwise God would not have inspired His holy

prophets to employ them, and so to convey to men His truth. I think I follow the literal method when I not only read the words of God's Message, but try to understand them, comparing them with one another, and comparing Scripture with Scripture.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH WITH REGARD TO THE OVERCROWDED DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

A PAPER BY THE REV. J. M. WILSON, M.A.,
HEAD MASTER OF CLIFTON COLLEGE, READ
AT THE CARLISLE CONGRESS.

THE principles which I shall briefly advocate are these: that it is the duty of the Church (1) to influence opinion by collecting facts about the dwellings of the poor; (2) to urge its members vigorously to promote improvements in the material conditions of life among the poor; (3) to set an example, by the expenditure of capital, in ways not directly remunerative, on the improvement, where desirable, of dwellings on Church property.

It is not the custom of the Congress to pass resolutions; but my aim and methods are contained in the following recommendations, founded on these principles.

a. That in the country sanitary associations be formed in each rural deanery, to call attention to this and cognate subjects, and to collect and diffuse information as to facts and causes and legal remedies.

b. That in each large town a committee, not limited to professed members of the Church of England, be invited by the Bishop to assist him in an inquiry into the conditions of life of the very poor.

A valuable precedent for this may be found in the city of Bristol.

c. That a searching examination be made by the Bishop in each diocese, or by some commission appointed by him, as to the condition and occupation of houses on the glebes and Church property in general.

Some precedent for this may be found, I believe, in the diocese of Lichfield.

d. That the Houses of Convocation in both Provinces be requested to collect, and summarise for publication, evidence on overcrowded dwellings, and their effects on the moral condition of the inhabitants.

The valuable report on intemperance will occur to all as a precedent.

e. That the trustees of Queen Anne's Bounty be requested to advance money not only under the Dilapidations Act for necessary repairs, but, under proper conditions, on the report of some special commissioner appointed by the Bishop for the purpose of improving cottages upon the glebe.

There is an objection *in limine*, which it is well to meet *in limine*. It is this. "Overcrowded dwellings," it is said, "like all other unfavourable conditions of life among the very poor, are the result of the laws of economical science; and with these the Church can no more interfere than she can with the law of gravitation. A wealthy philanthropist may here and there divert his spare thousands to build fancy cottages instead of green-houses, and let them at nominal rents. But that is not business; it is his fad. It will do no harm to get information, provided you don't attempt to act upon it. It is all ultimately a

question of business—of the 'cash nexus,' if you will. If it paid to provide better dwellings, they would be provided according to the law of demand and supply. If it does not pay, you must leave it alone, lest haply you be found to fight against the 'cash nexus.'"

And my reply is, that the very *raison d'être* and genius of Christianity is, by the implanting in men of a new motive and spirit, to fight such economic and social laws as act against the highest interests of society. It was not by "obeying laws of political economy" that Christianity worked its great social reforms; it was by an heroic enthusiasm for brotherhood in Christ that blindly defied and overcame the ordinary laws of economics. People talk about these laws as if they were an inexorable destiny. The laws simply tell us what will happen if we don't prevent it. There is a tendency towards degradation in a society left to itself, whose religion is, in brief, the "cash nexus" in this world, and heaven or hell in the next. The very *raison d'être* of Christianity is to fight this tendency by implanting Divine impulses in us towards a real brotherhood in this world. To give one example. The laws of demand and supply create a trade in young girls as prostitutes. We do not justify such a trade. We fight these laws. And so, as society grows more complex, we have to face old evils in new and aggravated forms; and the lack of home life in the overcrowded dwellings of our cities is one of these evils. Well, we must face it. The law of gravitation is the most universal of laws, but we defy it every day. We conquer the law of gravitation by mastering and applying the subtler forces of nature, its vital forces, its molecular forces. We can conquer, as men have conquered, the ordinary laws of economics by the finer forces of human nature, its patriotism, its enthusiasm, and most of all by the deep-set and all but universal instinct of religion. It is the work of the Church to apply to this purpose the mighty forces of love and humanity that can still be called out of men by the love of our Master.

The grounds, speaking broadly, for such an effort on the part of the Church as I am advocating are these:—

1. *It is in the true Spirit of Christ.*—The evidences of His message to earth were His works of compassion and His Divine sympathy with human needs. It was in a great measure this Spirit in His Church, the love and pity that mitigated human suffering and debasement, the redemption of man from actual evils, regardless of interference with economical laws, that established Christianity in the hearts of the people. We all feel, more or less, that mediæval and modern Christianity has gone off on side issues; that it does not adequately exhibit the spirit of brotherhood, and love, and respect for humanity, that breathes in the life and words of Christ. We can do something to recover the Spirit of Christ.

2. *It is the true Work of the Church.*—Of course, the word Church calls up very different ideas in the minds of those who hear me. It does so, because it is the name of a many-sided conception, only partly realised or realisable in fact, and no one of us can grasp even the idea as a whole. The more precise our definition, the more inadequate must be our conception. I shall attempt no definition, and will only say that, whatever other aspects there may be of the Church, we cannot but regard it, in one of its aspects, as an organised co-operation to further the spiritual development of man in the faith and spirit of Christ. Now it is conceivable that some day, possibly soon,

the Church may realise that she is not merely so many congregations, but is the people of England, and is also, in very truth, the body of Christ. To realise this apostolic idea, from which we are now so far, would be to fill us with a yet unimagined power to purify the nation from the physical and social evils which mar its spiritual development. The greater our unself-seeking aims, the stronger will be our hold on the people; it is not for our loftiness of purpose, it is for our meanness of purpose, that men sneer at the Church. And if the Church persistently expresses the highest mind and conscience of the nation, we may rely on it that the State will execute in the long run the ideas of the Church.

3. *It is the true Teaching of Revelation.*—KNOWLEDGE is God's revelation. He has taught us, and we know, that moral conditions are in a very high degree dependent on physical conditions. He has taught us, and we know, that a low and immoral type of human being is produced in the dens of our cities. We have to recognise that, whatever the origin of our race, its progress is one of development, which may be Divinely guided into an improvement, or by the withdrawal of higher influences may become a fatal degeneration. We have, therefore, if we would work together with God, to watch all that affects the physical and moral growth of our people. Probably more may be done now in many places for the gradual advance of Christian life among the classes now scarcely reached by our teaching, by affecting their material, moral, intellectual, and social conditions of life, than by direct but exclusive preaching of the Gospel message. The lesson of the parable of the Sower is not that it is our duty to sow seed indiscriminately in all soils, but that failure is certain, unless we previously prepare the soil. The Church must plough as well as sow. Nay, she must wait till the slow processes of nature make the soil. But she can hasten those processes.

4. *The Cure for the Estrangement both of the Intellectual and of the Artizan Classes*, from our present unworthy Christianity, will be found in some such principle as this. The speculative philosophies of our day, the ceaseless roar of competition in the world, and the smallness of the enthusiasms of the Church have combined to make men less hopeful, harder, and more critical of our pretensions. There is a widespread pessimism. Surely the cure for it is the vigorous belief, incessantly expressed in hopeful action, in the fundamental truth that man is verily a son of God and a member of Christ. Some of us hold this as a pious or academic opinion; some of us don't hold it at all. But we may come to see that this fundamental truth involves a passionate desire that the conditions of life for every man, woman, and child in England shall be worthy of that sonship and that membership. The Church has never been seized by this splendid optimism. She has had her enthusiasms for power, for independence, for uniformity, for doctrine, for continuity, for system; and she has been always more or less true to her mission to individuals; but never yet has she realised her work in the nation, to make our brotherhood not a dream, but a reality. When she does realise this the interest of all else will fade; the small will be driven out by the great; evil by the good; speculative difficulties will fall into their natural place, and will lose their power to alienate the intellectual classes; and there will wake in the heart of the people a response to the message of love that we shall never evoke in any other way. When that

reformation comes we shall perhaps see that men of the Oberlin and women of the Octavia Hill type, were "Reformers before the Reformation." And it is open to us in our various measures to be the same.

5. *Co-operation with the Nonconformist Churches* may be based on such high practical aims and work. Here is a field which we may enter as allies, all equally single-hearted; here we may learn mutual respect, heal up old wounds and scars, and find out true unity, and multiply our united strength tenfold. And I need not say that the Church of England ought to take the lead in all that is generous.

And now to conclude. In making efforts to improve the physical conditions of life of our people, we must not one whit relax our efforts in other directions. We must, of course, try to enlist the hearty co-operation of the people themselves in all endeavours to improve home life; but we must also try to get a better education for the nation in all its classes; we must try above all things to provide a larger-hearted, wiser, better ministry; and to establish a deeper personal faith in God, and holiness of life, and broader charity, and truer theology among the professing members of the Church. Redemption from spiritual and physical evils must go hand in hand; a nobler and purer life, to correspond with nobler and purer conditions. Better conditions of life alone will not suffice; the limit of their effect is soon reached. But at present, and for many a year to come, physical, social, political evils demand attention from the Church. For religion is based on the home, and myriads of our brothers and sisters have no home; their sleeping-places do not deserve the pure and sacred name of home; and the loss of home means physical and moral and spiritual atrophy, and social and political decay.

Such are the principles and the method of dealing with this and cognate subjects, and such are the reasons for those principles, which I would most humbly and earnestly press on all members of the Church; and I trust that, with God's blessing, some practical result may speedily follow from your deliberations and your actions.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ACCURACY.

SIR,—Referring to the notice of the *Expositor* in the PULPIT of the 11th inst., may I remonstrate against the worse than inaccuracy of calling it a *clerical* magazine, thus making *clerical* a synonym for *theological*, and implying that theology is an affair of the clergy alone, instead of being, as it is, a matter of interest to mankind. I am not a clergyman, but I have written in the *Expositor*.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, October 13th, 1884.

TUESDAY, November 11th, has been fixed upon as a "Quiet Day" of preparation for the Mission for the clergy of East London. The services will be held at St. Paul's, and addresses will be given by clergy of experience in Mission work at various hours, of which due notice will be published.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE PROPHETS OF CHRISTENDOM: SKETCHES OF EMINENT PREACHERS." By the Right Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, M.A., Lord Bishop of Ripon. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1884. Pp. 275.

THESE sketches, which were originally published in the *Clergyman's Magazine*, will be read with interest by many. They are short biographical outlines of Christian teachers in different ages of the Church, written in an interesting style, and containing many instructive details in sixteen short chapters.

The Preachers who spake as
never man spake.

St. John Chrysostom.

St. Basil the Great

St. Gregory Nazianzen.

St. Ambrose.

St. Augustine.

St. Jerome.

Dr. John Tauler of Strasburg.

Luther.

Herpde.

Bossuet.

Bourdoulou.

Massillon.

Jeremy Taylor.

Chalmers.

Dean Kirwan.

This work is neatly bound, and printed in a large distinct type, and we earnestly commend it to the notice of our readers.

THE Rev. Dr. Walters, vicar of Llansamlet, near Swansea, has been elected Proctor for St. David's, in the room of the late Rev. John Sinnett, vicar of Penboyr.

THE Rev. F. Vaughan Mather, vicar of St. Paul's, Clifton, Hon. Canon of Bristol and rural dean, has been elected Proctor in Convocation for Gloucester, in the room of the late Canon Fenn.

THE health of the Bishop of Oxford has much improved. He has been staying at Eastbourne for a few days' rest after the diocesan conference, and on Sunday morning preached to a crowded congregation at St. Saviour's on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Many were turned away from the doors. The collection amounted to upwards of £40, much the largest ever made in Eastbourne for the Society.

THE Bishop of Peterborough lately wrote to a Welsh correspondent:—"I cannot see what advantage there would be to any one, supposing even that I had leisure, first to investigate, and then to form a judgment upon, the votes and speeches of the Episcopate during a number of years past. Those who are disposed to think ill of Bishops will do so in spite of anything that I may say to the contrary, and those who are disposed to judge them fairly and charitably will do so without any help from me."

THE Bishop of Worcester presided at a meeting held on behalf of the National Society at Kidderminster on Tuesday week. His lordship, in introducing the claims of the society to the meeting, reminded those present that for many years the society had been the great means of providing, without any Parliamentary grant, the whole education given in Church schools, had subsequently been one of the channels for administering that grant, and was now the recognised means for protecting the interests of Church schools. His lordship strongly urged that board schools should be—as they were in Kidderminster—supplementary to and not in the place of voluntary schools.

ON Saturday, at Carlisle Cathedral, the Ven. A. B. Crosse, of Barrow-in-Furness, was installed as Archdeacon of Furness by the Dean in the presence of the four residentiary Canons. The Bishop's mandate was read in the Fraternity before the service. The Archdeacon was conducted by the Dean to his stall, which is next to those of the residentiary Canons, and on the left of the Dean. The usual form of institution was read by the Dean, after which the Archdeacon took his seat and the service continued. Amongst those present in the congregation were the Bishop of Bedford, Archdeacon Emery, Sir James Ramsden, and the Rev. A. R. Hull.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Akenhead, Rev. Edmund, L.T. University College, Durham, late Curate-in-Charge of Hessle, Hull; Curate-in-Charge of Appleton-le-Street-with-Amotherby, Malton.

Allnutt, Rev. Martyn R., Curate of St. Paul's, Upper Norwood; Vicar of All Hallows, Leeds.

Bayliss, Rev. William Wyke, M.A., Rector of Upham.

Bishop, Rev. Rhys, M.A., Curate of Moccas; Rector of Letton.

Blunn, Rev. James H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Nelson*.

Cattens, Rev. Thomas Edward Samuel, Incumbent of the New Church of St. Paul, Oswaldtwistle.

Childers, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of Armthorpe *alias* Amethorpe.

Courtenay, Rev. George Frederick, Vicar of Burrington, near Ludlow.

Crump, Rev. John H., B.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Smethwick.

Davey, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Rokeby.

Evans, Rev. John, late Curate of St. David's, Pembrokeshire; Vicar of Llansaintffread, Cardiganshire.

Flynn, Rev. Francis, B.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.

Forrest, Rev. R. W., D.D., Vicar of St. Jude's, Kensington; Chaplain to the Lord Mayor elect.

Hairs, Rev. Thomas Charles, Vicar of Alvaston, Derbyshire.

Halloran, Rev. Joseph Alfred, B.A., Vicar of Oxtou, Nottinghamshire.

Hammond, Rev. Robert Henry, Hon. Chaplain to the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, Liverpool, Brigade.

Hill, Rev. Arthur P., Chaplain to the *Neptune*.

Hobson, Rev. Richard, Incumbent of St. Nathaniel's, Windsor, Liverpool; Vicar of Garston, Liverpool.

Joy, Rev. Frederick Walker, Rector of Bentham.

Knight, Rev. John S., Chaplain to the *Indus*, for the *Tamar*.

Lindsay, Rev. John, late Vicar of St. John Baptist, Tue-Brook; Curate-in-Charge of Oldham, Bristol.

Massy, Rev. George Eyre, M.A., Rector of Gurnfreston, Pembrokeshire.

Palmer, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Queenborough; Vicar of Bethersden, Kent.

Riley, Rev. Francis George, M.A., Curate of Holbeach, Lincolnshire.

Sims, Rev. Herbert Marsh, B.A., Minister of the New Church of St. Cuthbert, Hunslet, Leeds.

Webster, Rev. A. R., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Martin's, Stamford, and Chaplain to the Marquis of Exeter; Vicar of Tinwell, Rutland.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Harris, Rev. Robert, Incumbent of Clare Abbey, at Clare Castle Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 80.

Lowthian, Rev. John, Vicar of Farlam, Cumberland, on the 6th inst., aged 79.

Thursby, Rev. William, of Ormerod House, Burnley, at 6, Brunswick Terrace, Brighton, on the 10th inst., aged 89.

Trevelyan, Rev. Walter H., at Westholme, Shepton Mallet, on the 9th inst., aged 44.

Wallace, Rev. Edwin, M.A., LL.D., Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College, Oxford, at Davos Platz, Switzerland, on the 6th inst.



The Church of England Pulpit.

LABOUR AND FLATTERY.

BY THE REV. CANON RAWSTORNE, M.A.,
VICAR OF PENWORTHAM.

SERMON PREACHED AT BLACKBURN PARISH
CHURCH, ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1884.

"All things are full of labour; man cannot utter it."—
ECCLESIASTES i. 8.

"For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloke of covetousness; God is witness."—1
THESS. ii. 5.

THE connection between the two texts which I have just recited will probably not be apparent to any hearer. Nor is that remarkable, for no such connection exists. They represent two distinct and separate lessons, one of which relates to the harvest thanksgiving as the festival of labour, and the other seems to me to caution against a danger which is very prominent in our times. We will take them separately at first, and perhaps, at last, they may combine to form a blended lesson of practical utility.

The harvest thanksgiving is the festival of labour, wherever, and on whatever objects that labour has been employed. We have long ceased to apply the word harvest exclusively to the ingathering of the fruits of the earth. There is the harvest of the land and the harvest of the sea; that of the mill, and the shop, and the office, and the counting-house, as well as that of the cornfield, or the garden, or the meadow; a harvest to be reaped, wherever man is earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, or the contraction of his muscles, or the racking of his brain. It is when, on an occasion of this kind, one makes the attempt to cast a comprehensive glance over the whole field of labour, that one becomes most conscious of the truth of the words of our text, that all things are full of labour. No man can describe how full.

And in one of these busy hives of industry, these manufacturing towns, we feel more keenly than elsewhere how universal is the truth—every street full of labour, every human being more or less at work.

There is one of the classes, of which our population is composed, which has had applied to it, or perhaps has arrogated to itself, the exclusive possession of the title—the labouring class. The exclusive right of those, whose labour is chiefly with their hands and bodies, to this proud title, for indeed it is a proud one, should be most decidedly denied. Brain work is more anxious, more painful, more difficult, more

exhausting than hand work. There is much more of conscious effort in it: the sensation occurs more often that the thing attempted is above our powers: and there is this great proof of the hardness of the strain, that it often and possibly more often exhausts a man before his time.

Such being the case (in a town like this, from which all the men of leisure flee away to purer air and clearer skies at a distance), there is no need of any of those classifications of human beings into orders and degrees, which are bad things in themselves, because they remind people of their differences instead of their likenesses, of their division rather than their union. We may address a congregation of this kind as entirely composed of working men and working women, engaged in different departments, but all employed, in fact, as members of one great labouring class, met together on an occasion such as this to thank God for the reward that He has been pleased to bestow on the labours of the year.

Nevertheless, since in common speech the name "Labouring Class" has been so often applied exclusively to those only who work with their hands and bodily frame, and since that application has created a distinction both in men's speech, and men's opinions, and even in national politics; let me venture to keep up that distinction for a few moments, and to point out, as shortly and as plainly as I can, a peculiar temptation which besets, at this moment more than at any other previous time in England, that class which is, although as we have seen already incorrectly, called in popular language, *The Labouring Class*.

This advice for the times is short and simple. It is that they take heed and beware of flattery. At present they are the subjects of the most fulsome flattery from all sides; from both parties in politics, and from all sects of religion. You would think, from the language that is to be heard alike from platforms and from pulpits, that the average working man is a model of virtue, and as great in intellectual enlightenment as he is in morality.

It seems, therefore, exceedingly opportune to describe the nature, and to relate the history, of this most deceiving vice. St. Paul well describes the motives from which flattery springs, when he protests, as he does in the epistle to the Thessalonians, that he had never used flattering words nor a cloak of covetousness.

Flattering words are always a cloak of covetousness. That is to say, the flatterer always wants to get something from the person whom he flatters. It need not necessarily be money; though that flattery, of which money is the object, is the grossest and coarsest form of the vice. But covetousness extends to other objects—in fact, as is suggested to us in the Tenth Commandment, to every possible object of human desire. And, along with it, flattery advances with equal step,

and exhibits itself in the most varied forms. Yet, however varied, its motive is always the same—covetousness. To begin from ourselves—the minister in his pulpit, who flatters the classes that supply his congregation, wants to maintain his circle of adherents, along with the various professional advantages which accrue to him from their support. The candidate, who approaches an elector with exaggerated politeness, is flattering him in order to get his vote. The politician, who delivers harangues, such as those with which the whole country is ringing, on the excellencies of the great Democracy, shows that he wants to acquire or to retain the power, the distinction, and the patronage, which belong to high offices in the State. All these are pretexts of covetousness, suggesting to these several persons the use of flattering words.

Such is the nature of flattery. And now let me give a sort of outline sketch of its history.

Its motive being covetousness, it naturally follows those who are for the time being the depositories of power; such having the good things of this world, which men covet, at their command. The prime author of all flattery knew well the nature of the sin, when he said to the Saviour and Representative of mankind, with reference to the kingdoms of the world, “If thou wilt worship me, all these shall be thine.” Worship is the crowning act of flattery, which covetousness bestows on those who have the good things of the world at their command.

In the earliest periods of history, the chief holders of power were kings. The flattery, submission, and even worship, which the Pharaohs and Nebuchadnezzars of old received, were boundless. The old tale of Canute and his courtiers by the waves of the sea is a true parable of the adulation with which monarchs were surrounded. Their most trifling words were greeted with applause; their will was their subjects’ law; and, naturally, they looked upon themselves as more than mortals. Even a potentate of such moderate dimensions as King David used to be approached by courtiers, who said to him, “My lord the king is as an angel of God, let him do what is good in his own eyes.” And he was sometimes tempted to act upon that doctrine, and then neither his subjects’ properties, nor persons, nor wives were spared, as was seen in the case of poor Uriah. But now flattery is passing away from royalty, along with power, and the remaining respect, which crowned heads receive, is largely composed of pity, with which, in the demagogues who have now become the potentates or power-holders, is combined an only too evident mixture of contempt.

Power, in many countries, and especially in our own, migrated first from royalty to aristocracies. Then arose that excessive adulation of the titled, which was flagrant in the eighteenth century, as may be seen in the dedication of books by men of

genius and intellect in the most fulsome terms to nobles worthy of no honour. We have not yet survived entirely the ill effects of this form of flattery, though it is passing, and will pass away, soon after the power, which has already disappeared.

For now we stand in the very crisis of a new migration of power. Power is passing to the masses of the people—to the Democracy. And flattery, conscious of the change that is in progress, has gone over to them already. The great object of contemporary flattery is no longer king, nor nobles, but what is called the people—*i.e.*, the larger number—the majority. And the words that are sounded in the ears of this new idol are precisely the same in substance as were those that were addressed in old time to King David,—“My lord, the king—king *Demos*—is as an angel of God, let him do what is right in his own eyes.” The will of the people is treated as the sole rule of right and wrong; the wishes of the people as the sole impulse by which governments are to be swayed. *Vox populi, vox Dei*. This is what is being repeated with weary reiteration and hollow insincerity in the speeches of scores of politicians, and in the leading articles of hundreds of newspapers. And, just as happened in old time to the kings, the objects of this adulation believe themselves to be all that the flatterers say they are. If they would reflect a while, they would soon see what is the motive of this flattery. It is now, as always, what St. Paul calls cloaked or concealed covetousness. The flatterer always wants something for himself—money, or fame, or place, or power, or admiration and applause. One thing acts as a bait to one man, and another to another. But he always wants something for himself. That differentiates the flatterer. Without the personal motive, he would not exist at all; he would not flatter, but would speak out the truth, whether it pleased or displeased his hearers.

And now my advice to the so-called labouring class is—shut your ears against all flattery whatever, and give every encouragement to the man who will tell you the truth. And it would not be injudicious to estimate a man’s truthfulness by his not being afraid of hitting the persons he speaks to rather hard. Will those present now bear to hear an estimate of themselves based on tolerably wide acquaintance, from one not blind to their many merits. One thing is quite certain, they are not angels of God, fit to be encouraged to do whatever seems right in their own eyes. Nor are they fit to wield the unchecked ascendancy, which those who desire to exercise by delegation, as their demagogues, the power which is falling into their hands, would wish to entrust to them. Like all other classes, they number some who are very good, and some who are very bad, while the great majority stand or fluctuate, at all the intervening degrees in the moral thermometer. When compared with

the corresponding class in other nations, or with the other classes in their own country, they are found superior in some points and inferior in others, so that it is impossible to strike a balance, and say which stands, on the whole, the highest or the lowest. If we exclude from our view the very good and the very bad, and only consider average specimens of the whole class, we find widely diffused among them several splendid virtues. They are instinctively law-abiding. They are more industrious, more persevering, more honest, more truthful, than the corresponding class in most other nations. They are very hearty and warm-affectioned, at least in these northern regions. They are charitably helpful to each other, and warmly attached to those who have shown them kindness. But then, on the other hand, there are moral faults of the gravest kind. Coarse sensuality is frequent among them, above the average of other nations. They care too much for meat and drink; they are too readily betrayed into degrading sexual vices, as well as intemperance; and very many are lacking in that courtesy of speech which always attends a class that thoroughly respects itself, and knows itself to be rising, not merely in wealth and power, but in intelligence and morals. This last fault—the coarseness and rudeness of speech prevailing in so many working men's intercourse with each other—is the fault that first strikes foreigners who visit us. A clever Frenchman, Mr. Max O'Rell, who has passed many years in England, has lately written a book about our ways and manners, which he calls "John Bull and his Island," which has been translated, and is sold cheap. He is very free in his comments on all classes, and the thing which he chiefly notices in the working class is the coarse language that they use in conversing with one another. There is a passage* in that book, purporting to be a specimen of the prevailing style of conversation, which I dare not quote here in the pulpit, but which is true to the life, and one that I would give a great deal to be able to think untrue. But, along with this, there is a strong and very genuine desire to rise in real inward quality, intellectual and moral, as well as in position and power. And this desire is, I am thankful to say, much the most evident in the young. So that the future, which belongs to the young, is brighter than

the past. I have now enlarged, too long perhaps, on the faults and virtues of king *Demos*, who is just beginning to reign. Though he is hardly yet settled on his throne, the flatterers are all at work upon him already, as upon an heir about to succeed to property and title. Poor king *Demos*! Even without flattery he is but too apt to think his prospects grand and himself grander. He himself is not a very august potentate, but his prospects of power are very great, and along with them his responsibilities. With education improving, but not yet sufficient; with views widening, but not yet wide enough, he is seizing, or his flatterers are pressing on him, the powers and responsibilities of empire; and he is, and is henceforth to be always, surrounded by all the adulation that waits on power. Men, whose careers, and honours, and emoluments depend on his approbation, will henceforth cluster round him, and tell him (as they are already telling him) that he is as an angel of God, who may do what is good in his own eyes. He may do well yet, if only he will remember that flattery is always, as St. Paul says, the cloak of covetousness, and that the flatterer invariably flatters because he wants something for himself. Then he will shut his ears to flattery, and listen rather to those who venture to tell him that he needs to be curbed and restrained, and that he is not fit to have the reins of government thrown entirely loose upon his neck.

And now let us return to our text again to find a lesson suitable to the whole labouring class alike, to the men of working brains, as well as of those of working limbs. "All things are full of labour:" man cannot express "how full." We have found it so in the year, whose fruit and return we celebrate to-day, and also in every preceding year of our earthly pilgrimage. There has been a great deal to do. Often labour has wearied out our feeble frame; often it has proved a heavy burden to our mind. But, for all that, have we had cause to repine that man has been commanded, not condemned, to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow, and that, ever since the creation, he has gone forth at morning to his work and to his labour until the evening, and will do so even to the end? No—surely work is a blessing. How many a painful hour has it sweetened for us all? Do we not know what it is to ask, partly of our work itself, and partly of our heavenly Father, that most merciful of taskmasters, who sets us these daily tasks of ours, for relief from those burdens of anxiety which we have felt for the health, or the life, or the support of our own, for consolation after our last partings, and for the comfort of many other of the ills of life; and has not our Father given to us the remedy that we sought through his creature—work? We laboured till we were tired, and then God gave us afterwards the sweet sleep of the labouring man. Is there any labourer amongst us to whom that happy experience is unknown?

* The following is the passage:—"La basse classe semble n'avoir qu'un adjectif à sa disposition, c'est l'adjectif *sanguinaire* (bloody). Ce mot, qui correspond à notre juron *sacré*, fait frémir en Angleterre; il ne peut que nous paraître ridicule. Un ouvrier anglais dira, par exemple: 'J'ai dit à mon *bloody* patron qu'il ne me donnait qu'un *bloody* souverain toutes les *bloody* semaines, qu'il me fallait cinq *bloody* schellings de plus. Il m'a répondu qu'il n'avait pas le *bloody* temps d'écouter mes *bloody* plaintes,' etc.—"John Bull et son île," page 83. This is true to the life—only the vocabulary is not so scanty as our French visitor supposes. There are two or three other words, both substantives and adjectives, as habitually used, and even more brutal.

Nor have our labours been without their reward. We may have been in the past year successful or unsuccessful, according to the measure of our own desires. God may have given us little, in comparison with what we hoped and expected. Yet has he not given us enough—enough for life—enough for comfort and happiness? Or, if the past year has been one of misfortune to any one, if much has been taken away, yet, amidst privation, has He not left enough? amidst sorrow, has He not left hope, consolation, even joy? The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the Name of the Lord. Such has been the past.

And the future must be expected to be as the past. "All things will be full of labour;" man cannot express how full. So will it continue even to the end, so long as the power to labour remains. Many of us feel, both in our limbs and in our intellectual powers, the progress of decay, and there is nothing that we are more inclined to be discontented with than this gradual curtailment of our faculties of body and mind. Yet it is, after all, the gradual process by which our heavenly Father is admitting us to rest. As the power to labour gradually contracts, the hours of rest will increase in number, until at last they will have quite superseded labour; and then will come the final rest. Thus, spreading gently over us like the evening shade, rest covers by degrees the whole surface of life, and labour disappears, till at last we reach the

Rest of the weary, joy of the sad;
Hope of the dreary, light of the glad;
Home of the stranger, strength to the end;
Refuge from danger, Saviour and Friend.
Pillow, where lying, love rests its head,
Peace of the dying, life of the dead.

Then, lastly,

Safe in the arms of Jesus,
Safe on his gentle breast,
There by his love o'ershadowed,
Safely our souls shall rest.

THE GREATNESS OF SOLOMON AND SOLOMON'S GOD."

BY THE REV. FREDERICK C. WILLIAMSON,
B.A., SENIOR CURATE OF ST. GABRIEL'S,
PIMLICO, LATE SCHOLAR OF PEMBROKE COL-
LEGE, OXFORD.

SERMON PREACHED IN WEST HACKNEY.

"And when the queen of Sheba had seen all Solomon's wisdom, and the house that he had built, and the meat of his table, and the sitting of his servants, and the attendance of his ministers, and their apparel, and his cupbearers, and his ascent by which he went up unto the house of the Lord; there was no more spirit in her."—1 Kings x. 4, 5.

FAR and wide was known the wisdom of Solomon, king of Judah. "The countries marvelled at him for his interpretations and songs, and proverbs and parallels."

Like Hiram, king of Tyre, the queen of Sheba, in her far-away home, must have oftentimes heard of Solomon's wisdom, of his proverbs and hard sayings; and she would come and see him in his own home, and hear with her own ears, and see with her own eyes, and learn whether all she had heard of him—his wisdom, his greatness, his riches—were true.

It does not seem certain who this queen of Sheba was, or where she came from. Josephus speaks of her as queen of Egypt and Ethiopia. The traditions concerning her divide themselves into two classes, as Dean Stanley points out.

The Abyssinian, by which she is represented as bearing a child to Solomon, from whom the present kings of Abyssinia claim descent; and it is, as he remarks, very strange that perhaps the most degraded of Christian Churches should thus claim descent from the best and most civilised period in the Church of Israel.

Another tradition, the Arab, identifies Sheba with the Arabian Sabæa, and describes some of the trials of wit—how the queen sent two troops of boys dressed like girls, and girls dressed like boys, and nosegays of artificial flowers, which were to be distinguished from real flowers by sight only; we are told how Solomon detected the boys and girls by the different way in which they washed, and the difference between the real and artificial flowers by letting the bees settle on them.

"The queen of Sheba came to prove Solomon with hard questions; and Solomon told her all her questions; there was not anything hid from the king which he told her not."

So it happened that when the queen found all her hard questions answered with ease, when she found that Solomon's wisdom and prosperity far exceeded the fame she had heard, when, above all, she had seen the "ascent by which he went up into the house of the Lord, *there was no more spirit in her.*" "Happy are thy men," she cried, "happy are these, thy servants, which stand continually before thee, and that hear thy wisdom."

We have of late heard a good deal of the rights and wrongs of a certain disrowned king, and we have in the last few days heard how he has landed on our shores. Concerning the visit of this personage from a political point of view, I have nothing whatever to say. Doubtless the Government have had the best of reasons for bringing him over to this country. I only allude to his visit because there are, as it seems to me, one or two points of resemblance with that of the Queen of Sheba of whom we have read to-day. Each alike in their far-off home had heard of the might, the power, the civilisation of the land beyond the sea: each longed, it may be for different reasons, to visit that land; each alike were enabled to gratify their longing.

We know what in the queen of Sheba's case was the result of her visit to Jerusalem, then the centre of wisdom and religious culture. What

will be the result of the other visit to which we have alluded it is impossible to say ; but whether the Zulu king be successful in obtaining that which is the immediate object of his visit, viz. his restoration to his throne, it cannot be that his visit to such a country as this will be without its influence, more or less lasting, upon his character. He has of course often heard of England and Englishmen, but his visit to this country will show him things in a somewhat new light. A photograph of a 100-ton gun, or of one of our great ironclads, gives some idea of their proportions and appearance ; but unless we have stood alongside the gun and seen it fired, unless we have been on board and seen the great engines at work, the many labour-saving appliances, and, above all perhaps, wondered at the wonderful discipline, we shall have but a very imperfect idea of either the gun or the ship. Try to put yourself in this Zulu king's place ; imagine yourself brought for the first time face to face with the wonders, the resources of a great country ; a great city like this. Can you not fancy yourself crushed with a sense of your comparative insignificance and inferiority, as if "there were no more spirit in you" ?

Be this as it may, our royal visitor will doubtless inquire into the causes of the greatness and prosperity of our Western nations, and he will, we hope, hear what an important factor Christianity has been during the last nineteen centuries in the growth and development and improvement of the human child ; how it "has done a work that no glory of physical science can equal, and no instrument of physical science compass, in purifying men's appetites, in setting discipline and direction in their lives, and in offering to humanity new types of moral obligation and fairer ideals of saintly perfection, whose light still shines like a star to guide our own poor voyages."

But if the spirit of the rude savage—I am not, of course, alluding to our visitor—sinks when brought face to face with the highest culture and civilisation, with what feelings does the cultured civilised Christian look for the first time on a savage in his own native haunt, amid his own surroundings, or man in his lowest, most savage state ! One's mind hurries back over past centuries, and then asks, "Could our progenitors have been men like these—men whose very signs and expressions are less intelligible to us than those of the domesticated animals—men who do not possess the instinct of those animals, nor yet appear to boast of human reason, or at least of arts consequent on that reason ?" I do not believe it possible to describe the difference between savage and civilised man : it is the difference between a tame and a wild animal.

It is well to think of these things, so perhaps we may learn to be thankful for our "creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life, for the means of grace and hope of glory." It is well

to ask ourselves what are we doing—we who have been warmed with the rays of the Sun of Righteousness, we who have been brought to the knowledge of God—what are we doing to enlighten others who still sit in darkness and in the shadow of death ? Are we doing anything to wipe away the reproach that has been cast on so-called Christian England ? There is a singular delusion pervading the English mind that we can civilise and improve a people. It is just the one thing we have never been able to do. "No nation in history has had so many opportunities of imparting Christianity and civilisation to the Gentiles. We have been brought in contact with the heathen, the fire-worshipper, the Buddhist. Have we really Christianised twenty square miles of any continent or island ? Have we made any race or whole people in the whole wide circle of our vast dominion more truthful, more honest, more chaste, or even more happy than they were before they came in contact with us and our civilisation ?"

Not unprofitably may we, whose lines are cast in this nineteenth century, spend a little while in foregoing with our heathen ancestors.

But, again, are there none who have, like the Queen of Sheba, felt their spirits sink within them, none who have been awakened to a humbling sense of their own inferiority and powerlessness, when brought face to face with the mighty forces of Nature ?

It may be that among the thousands that throng this great city there are numbers in whom this feeling has never been awakened. The forces of Nature—Nature itself is to them an unsealed book. They have seen nothing, perhaps, more awful than a flash of lightning. They know not what it is to listen to the sullen roar of the mighty avalanche, as with resistless force it glides down the mountain side, sweeping into one common grave all that lies in its track. They have never felt the earth, "which from childhood they have been accustomed to regard as the type of all that was solid and substantial," they have never felt the earth tremble and quake beneath their feet, have never seen the earthquake destroy in a few brief seconds the works that had taken men years to build—they know not how by these mighty subterranean forces whole continents have been raised, and vast tracts of land submerged. The earthquake, the avalanche, the whirlwind, all convince us of our feebleness and inability to control their giant forces. Brought face to face with them, our "spirits sink within us." But we are beginning to learn that all these mighty forces do not act at random ; they all act in obedience to certain laws, or rather, perhaps we should say, a law of nature, with which we are but very imperfectly acquainted, for we poor mortals, as some one says, are but as minnows in the burn, that know nothing of the laws and nature of the far-off ocean.

But this law of nature, or, if you will, these laws

of nature, imply a Lawmaker. If there are laws, there must be some one to make them. Behind all the Christian sees the Lord of all power and might, the Author and Giver of all good things. "The waves of the sea are mighty, and rage horribly; yet the Lord who dwelleth on high is mightier." But does not the Christian's spirit sink within him as he contemplates this Lord of all power and might, this high and almighty One that inhabiteth eternity? Does not the "brightness of His glory" bedazzle us?

We remember the famous description of the man borne by angels into the immediate presence of his God. "Suddenly, as they rode from infinite to infinite, suddenly, as they tilted over abysmal worlds, a mighty cry arose that mysteries more mysterious, worlds more billowy, other heights, other depths, were dawning, were nearing, were nigh at hand. Then the man sighed, stopped, shuddered, and wept. His overlaid heart uttered itself in tears, and he said, 'Angel, I will go no further; for the spirit of man aches under this infinity. Insufferable is the glory of God's house. Let me lie down in the grave, that I may find rest from the persecutions of the infinite; for end, I see, there is none.' And from all the listening stars that shone around issued one choral chant, 'Even so it is. Angel, thou knowest that it is; and there is none that ever yet we heard of.' 'End is there none?' the angel solemnly demanded; 'and is this the sorrow that kills you?' But no voice answered, that he might answer himself. Then the angel threw up his glorious hands to the heaven of heavens, saying, 'End is there none in the universe of God? So also there is no beginning.'"

There have been times when we, too, have been burdened with the sense of the infinity of God, when we have been overlaid with the awfulness of God's majesty; there have been times, doubtless, when, as we thought of the measureless distance between the creature and the Creator, we have felt as if "there was no more spirit in us." But hark! across the centuries there comes the cry of CHRIST, the God-Man. "No man cometh to the Father but by Me. I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." The divine words cheer our sinking spirits, and we remember that since we have been made members of Christ, we are THEREFORE children of God, children of the Ineffable Being whom we have thought so far off.

We shall do well to imitate the earnestness and perseverance of the Queen of Sheba in her search after truth, which won for her the undying commendation of our Lord—"The Queen of Sheba shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon."

To ask questions rightly, says Bacon, is the half of knowledge.

There is a story told of a Bishop of Lyons, who, when asked by a heathen, "Who is the God of

the Christians?" replied, 'Εὰν ᾗς ἄξιός γινώσῃ. "If you really wish to know, if you be disposed with hearty desires of learning what you ask for, you shall quickly know."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E. C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months' 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Requirer.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1884.

SOCIAL PURITY.

WE are glad to see that this highly important subject is now receiving its due measure of attention from Churchmen of all shades of opinion and schools of thought, and that they are alive to the great danger that exists in this respect. The subject has been discussed at some of the recent Diocesan Conferences, and resolutions have been passed that it was necessary to form diocesan branches of the Church of England Purity Society, while at the Carlisle Congress, as also at the Reading Congress, this subject was discussed with unwonted vigour by men well able from practical experience to deal with the subject. And while organisations are at work to try to stem the tide of immorality—whether it be the Social Purity Alliance, or the Church of England Purity Society, or the Bishop of Durham's White Cross Army, all of them working in a corporate capacity—we believe that the greatest help will be that of personal influence, if we can but establish a healthy tone among our men and young men, and teach them in every way that we can that their bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and that it is a great and deadly sin to defile that temple which He has made. For evidence of what can be done by personal influence and instruction, we commend the careful study of the Rev. Edward Thring's Paper, which appears on another page. We know that he has done work of the very highest value, and of the most Christ-like nature, to his boys at Uppingham, and through them to the English race; and

we are rejoiced that he has had the courage to publish the principles, motives, and exhortations by which he has accomplished so much for the salvation of men. As for the taunts of the self-righteous, that he has taken low ground, that he has laid his foundation on the solid truth of the sexual function being God's own precious gift, that he has laid down proper drains, emptied cesspools, and done the work of a scavenger, that he has laid stress on the promise of a long and healthy life in this world, as well as in the next, to such of his boys as honoured that function in father and mother, and that he has specified the true sphere of woman, we regard them as the highest compliments, and trust that the clergy will follow his example, for they may be assured that he is right in saying that "curiosity, ignorance, and lies form a very hotbed of impurity." It has been suggested that the societies which exist for dealing specially with this evil should be worked on the same lines, and in a similar manner, as the Church of England Temperance Society has been worked; but an objection has been raised in a recent issue of the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle* against this proposal. The temperance crusade is against an open and avowed evil, and one which must be met by an organised effort; and while the temperance lecturer can easily refer to the results of intemperance, which may be seen in every-day life, and which one can read of in the columns of the daily papers, it is a very different thing to speak openly and plainly, even in an assembly entirely composed of men, of the sins of the flesh, and there is also the danger lest, when speaking of these things, thoughts and ideas should be suggested which men and young men would otherwise scarcely dream of or imagine. We have it on authority that in a large meeting, entirely composed of men and young men, which was held in a provincial town to discuss this very question, things were mentioned of which some, even men of experience, had never heard. The question then suggests itself, What is the best means of promoting this important work? The societies have, we believe, certain pledges or resolutions, one of the principal of which is, To respect the honour of women, and also to maintain purity in themselves. But is there not another pledge which is of equal force, and quite as binding on the conscience of the Christian—that which our Catechism teaches us, viz., to keep our bodies in temperance, soberness, and *chastity*. And all societies, no matter whatever name they may be called by, only end in this; and it may be that the absence of clear, definite teaching on this latter point has given rise to the need and necessity of organised work, to counteract the baneful effects of an organised sin, one of the assaults of the Evil One. For there is no one thing that we ought to guard more jealously than our own purity and chastity, and not only our own but that of others.

There is one opportunity when a few words spoken to the young may do a great deal of good, and that is the time of Confirmation, when the clergyman has the opportunity of saying a word in season. So again those who have especial charge of the young can by wholesome advice, well-weighed, well-considered words, teach our lads and young men the necessity of remembering what is due unto themselves, and also, which is of great importance, what is due from them to others. If these lessons are taught carefully and discreetly then shall we see them growing up holy, *pure*, and good. And not only in schools, not only at the time of Confirmation, do we need plain speaking, but also we want our work-shops improving. It has been no uncommon thing for some who ought to know better to allude to subjects of impurity in the work-shops, in the presence of those to whom such conversation is injurious in the highest degree, and here we think that the societies may do some good if by any means they can improve the moral atmosphere of the workshops, and by means of special services for men teach them how much they can do by example. And closely allied to this subject is the question of the housing of the poor. It is no use circulating sentimental books as to what the poor should do, when we remember that large families are often herded together in small cottages quite inadequate to their needs. It is the same in many country villages and small towns as it is in the large cities. There may not be the "rookeries" which exist in some parts of the metropolis, but overcrowding exists in all its manifold forms; and therefore, if we would stem the tide of immorality, it must be by clear and definite teaching on the one hand, and on the other accompanied by larger, better, and more commodious cottages; and if every landlord would but limit the number of occupants in each cottage, so that no one cottage should contain more than it is evidently built for, some good might be done in this way. Of course it is a very difficult subject, but no effort should be considered too great, no opportunity let pass, to remove in any way that we can this baneful scourge of impurity and immorality from our land, the home of the "brave and the free."

THE BEST MEANS OF RAISING THE
STANDARD OF PUBLIC MORALITY.

BY REV. E. THRING, M.A., HEAD MASTER OF
UPPINGHAM SCHOOL.

A PAPER READ AT THE CARLISLE CHURCH CON-
GRESS, 1884.

MY LORD AND GENTLEMEN,—In obedience to your commands, I stand before you to-day to make the attempt, since it is your pleasure, to deal in

twenty minutes with the central fact of the human world.

I shall endeavour to suggest some lines of thought and action.

The subject of purity falls under the head of life and the transmission of life.

No nation lives long, no individual lives long, who pollutes the sources of life persistently.

Therefore, true views of life, and of sex in relation to life, are absolutely necessary, if ever human nature is to stand on firm ground, and resist evil effectually. What men think facts to be, decides what they do.

The facts of the subject require firm, unmythical statement. They require, first, that the solemn, yet every-day character, of the sexual faculty, as human life, should be realised; and secondly, that voluptuous lies, which lie by exaggerating the *power of lust*, should be got rid of, whether the exaggeration consist of exaggerated sensuality, or of exaggerated praise of escaping from sensuality.

First, then, the nature and value of life determines the whole question and its treatment.

The facts, for a Christian, start with God's gift of life to man, "The Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" and in God's gift of life to woman, in order to be "a help meet for him," in the work given him to do.

Life and work, then, are the key-notes.

The first great law is, that the sexes were created to help one another; a law of partnership in work. Work cannot be done truly without both. This is the law of the gift of life.

Next, God willed that this gift of life should be transmitted by the union of man and woman. God's act of giving life is thus directly continued by sexual intercourse.

God also gave a blessing, which was a command: "Be fruitful and multiply," etc.

Our Lord Christ sends us back to this original charter for right knowledge: "In the beginning God created them male and female; therefore," etc.

Purity then means life from God in true action; and impurity means treason against God's life. It is as manly in a man to be pure, as it is womanly in a woman, and it is as possible.

The original charter is renewed at Mount Sinai, when God made honour of father and mother—honour, that is, of the holy transmission of human life and the duties belonging to it—the title to the one supreme blessing of His covenant; the title to the individual, and through the individual to the nation, of long life in the Promised Land. This is decisive as to the supreme place given to holy transmission of human life in this world.

I cannot but think that a frank acceptance of the facts of God's world—God's facts—would greatly check impurity by giving nobler views. As men think, so do they act; mean thoughts are strong temptations. The thoughts must be set right first. The foremost fact of all the world as regards human nature, to me, is that the life of the human race is entrusted to sexual union. The crowning fact of Revelation, to me, is the revelation of the Bride—all mankind gathered up into the perfect excellence of *womanly* glory to be presented to the Bridegroom.

What men ought to think of women is fixed for evermore by this divine intimation that the highest excellence is in character *womanly*.

The most marvellous fact in the human world of

life is to me the purity of marriage—God in this justifying His command.

1st. The wonderful purity of good women.

2nd. The wonderful advance in purity of the chaste man, and the abolition of lust—the true virginity, the circumcision of the spirit.

How infinitely higher a man feels that virginity to be, to which the woman brings no lust, than that which, however complete (and I think I know what I am speaking of when I say "complete"), was virgin only by banishing womanhood from its world.

But this lowering of sex to a temptation which must be banished is unhealthy and untrue; however necessary it may be, and is, to keep the thoughts from dwelling on sex. They who know that there is no lust, no vile magic, in true sexual relations, will have cleaner imaginations than those who think them sensual. And cleaner imaginations mean greater freedom from temptation, and cleaner life. The morbid glorification which banishes sex as a too-powerful temptation has, I am sure, much to answer for in *making* the temptation too powerful.

Moreover, that which ought to be banished easily passes into being thought an evil and a curse in itself. But sex is not a curse. Human nature, in its noblest men and women, its best fathers and mothers, in those who give a meaning to the prayer, "Our Father," is traduced and degraded by this view, and the temptation of lust glorified.

Lust is a curse, but not a curse connected with the female sex, as many practically think, and would think with truth if lust belonged of necessity to sexual intercourse, and absence of lust to abstaining from it. Women would be better out of the world if this was true, and the whole female sex a necessary evil; for man chooses to think himself on a higher level—falsely thinks so, since male and female are on the same level. The life of both is equally concerned in being true and faithful to God's gift of life; and the penalties on unchastity inflicted by God on the body and soul in this world are the same for both.

The basis of all true chastity is a true reverence for sex; a true knowledge that the purity of the body is the one great act of allegiance to God, and loyalty to the Giver of Life; and a clear understanding that lust is a deadly disease, which does not belong to sex and the sexual relations when rightly carried out. The whole subject requires to be lifted out of the mire of heathenism, from which it has never quite emerged. It does not matter whether it be male or female, young or old, married or unmarried, the heathenism must be cut out, which exaggerates with heathen voluptuousness of desire, or scarcely less heathen fear, the sexual relations, and implies that there must be lust; whereas lust always and in everyone is equally vile, and is capable of extinction. In the transmission of God's original gift of life, the duties of life and work come first; and women are as necessary for true work as men. True work does away with distinctions of sex. Single or married, old maid or bachelor, are lost in common honour as soon as work takes the first place. This fact determines the treatment and education of women. Honour as workers and a worker's training is their due. They are God's workers first; females afterwards. The goddess theory is simply lust disguised; condemn a nation, or a generation, which puts women aside from the work of life with a false idolatry. The petted slave of the wealthy becomes the beast-of-burden slave of the poor. When women receive true reverence as fellow-workers

and helpers, and not as females, then much impurity will vanish. It is one of the great hopes of our time that woman's work is largely recognised. But as long as the fascination, beauty, and accomplishments (evil word) are put in the place of God's facts of life, the battle is lost for the young before it is begun. They enter on life *δεδουλωμένοι ἡδῇ*, utterly mistaken in their ideas of purity, full of unclean imaginations about sex which are not true, and of unclean glorification of sex which is not true. The police reports give fatal evidence how utterly the enchantment of passion dies out, and fails to protect from brutal violence even her who seemed so supreme and so secure in command. I say nothing about solitary sin, or uncleanness, alone or with others, for higher truth to begin with, shuts the door on uncleanness, and gives it no chance. The solemn responsibility of sex, as God's ministry of human life, must be established. As strong a religious conviction of the true honour of men and women is needed as the monks and nuns of old had of what was imperfect, or false. The world needs to revere womanhood with the sober reverence due to her as one who by God's law is a fellow-helper; the world needs to shake off the heathenism of early times, and learn the secret of complete self-mastery. To raise womanhood is to purify the world. Men and women have to be wrought into perfect excellence by accepting fully and frankly the last and highest revelation, which sets before mankind as the highest perfection the womanly glory of the bride.

The next point I wish to urge is, the necessity of fair conditions of life. Without these it is useless to say much. It is all very well laying down principles; words are a great power where there is freedom of action. But with the very poor, or boys at school, there is no freedom of action. All their surroundings are fixed for them, and that movement of life which pushes all hindrances out of the way, and shapes a world fitted for itself to live in, is denied to them. But, if the conditions are unfitted for life, life dies. Foul air kills animal life; foul surroundings kill higher life. Whole families pigging in one room cannot, in a civilised country, be chaste. We have talked too much, and done too little. We are too religious. We talk of divine truths, and build churches, when we ought in God's name, and for Christ's sake, to be going round with a scavenger's cart and a navvy's pickaxe, carting off filth and making sewers.

I believe in a Gospel which builds sewers first and churches afterwards; or, to drop metaphor, which goes to the lowest thing that needs to be done and does it, in word and deed, as the highest form of religion. Christ began low down. His coming to earth was in itself a beginning low down, and doing what had to be done. Little or no real good is dropped down from above. Thank God, my Lady Bountiful has had her day; at least partially so. Personal help and personal devotion never rest satisfied till the wrong is made right. The poor, with their one room, must be helped to help themselves to a better state of things, or they cannot be chaste. Boys at school, also, should be protected by all their surroundings being framed, unknown to them, so as to shut off temptation. The whole structure and system should act as an unseen friend. There is much virtue, or vice, in a wall. Witness the one room. No words, no personal influence, no religion even, can do instead of the holy help of the wall, or overcome its evil, if evil. These words involve

serious results in practice. They involve the teaching and training of every boy, with adequate machinery for doing it.

The young cannot be dealt with in herds.

The house accommodation should make every boy feel himself cared for. But this is a matter of infinite skill and much expense.

The class working should thoroughly handle each boy, and leave no unswept corners.

Many objects of interest should be there. One boy is caught in one net, another in another.

The whole atmosphere should be an atmosphere of work and life, with time fully occupied, and an involuntary, quiet throwing of light on all the boy-life.

If this was the atmosphere of England, much impurity would vanish from schools. Neglect and faulty structure breed impurity as in a hotbed. Talk cannot get over this. Alter the conditions, or be silent.

It is enough for me merely to point out this difficulty. The good wall, within a certain range, is omnipotent. I will now pass on to a kindred subject. Good work is needed, but how much more needed is good amusement. Men and women, who have no earthly pleasure save sex and beer, cannot be chaste. I hold the man who in this generation provides good amusement for the poor, and teaches them to enjoy it, to be pre-eminently a man of God. Merry England, rightly understood, is the noblest title a nation could have. Alas, for merry England! Help the helpless to reconstruct their surroundings, or they cannot be chaste.

Help the helpless to true pleasure, or they cannot be chaste.

If you are not ready to do this, be silent. Your words mock the unfortunate.

This may seem taking low ground. Well, taking low ground in action is the only thing I believe in; taking low ground from high principle.

Find out the beginning and begin. In building a house, never omit the kitchen.

The next point belongs especially to the higher homes and to schools. Curiosity, ignorance, and lies form a very hotbed of impurity. We pay heavily for our civilised habits in false shame, and the mystery in which sex and womanhood is wrapped. I confess that for curiosity I have no remedy to propose. Ignorance and lies are on a different footing. I suppose every one is acquainted with some of the current lies which are repeated, of the impossibility of being pure. The only answer to this, is a flat denial from experience. I know it is possible, and when once attained, easy. The means, under God, in my own case were a letter from my father. A quiet, simple statement of the sinfulness of the sin, and a few of the plain texts from St. Paul saved me. After a struggle, which consisted in shutting off by degrees all thought of sex by higher thoughts and prayer, self-mastery to the extent of perfect willingness to remain unmarried all my life was attained. My life was temperate, but not ascetic; and my habits were habits of great physical strength. In activity and game-playing power, there were few whom I would not have met. Pardon the personal narrative. To dare to give it appears to me the only course open. A film fell from my eyes at my father's letter. My first statement is, that all fathers ought to write such a simple letter to their sons. It is not difficult if done in a common-sense way.

Following out this plan, at Uppingham, in the

morning Bible lessons, I have always spoken, as occasion arose, with perfect plainness on lust, and its devil-worship; particularly noting its deadly effect on human life, and its early and dishonoured graves. But as I believe that keeping the thoughts clean is the only way for the young to be chaste, I strongly disapprove of all questioning, and morbid anatomy, and individual probing. If a lad seeks advice, the advice I give him is what I have given above—advice to forget, to pray, to aim higher. There is no hope as long as the thoughts, on any pretext, are turned on the object. Seclusion is most dangerous. To forget is the only safety. But ignorance is deadly, because perfect ignorance in a boy is impossible. I consider the half-ignorance so deadly that, once a year, at the time of confirmation, I speak openly to the whole school divided into three different sets. First I take the confirmees, then the communicants and older boys, then the younger boys on three following nights after evening prayers. The two first sets I speak very plainly to; the last I only warn against all indecency in thought, word, or deed, whether alone or with companions. Thus no boy who has been at school a whole year can sin in ignorance. And a boy who despises this warning is justly turned out of the school on conviction.

Again, the company and presence of good women is the greatest possible safeguard to the young. We make it part of our school system that the ladies of the houses shall, as their understood duty, look after the boys, be with them as much as possible, and take interest in their games. Our arrangements make this natural and easy, more especially the music. The music brings in the ladies, young and old, as fellow-singers and helpers in the actual work, and also furnishes common ground to meet on. Something of the same kind for the poor, choral societies and musical teaching, appears to me very much needed.

Finally, the whole subject may be summed up in a few sentences. Birth and death, the beginning and the end of life, are for ever going on as part of the machinery of the human world. The exigencies of work push death out of the way at once; much as it touches us, it cannot be lingered over. So, also, I conceive, it ought to be with the sexual question; it is a subordinate part of the machinery of human life. Make it so. Subordinate it to true work in life. Think of men and women, not as breeding animals, but as partners, and joint workers in a kingdom of life, where society has to be saved, and not our own souls merely; where mankind are being all gathered up into the glorious ideal of the Bride. A sober, honest, yet noble, view of men, women, and life will go far to put an end to impurity.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—In my last letter I pointed out the illusory nature of the argument for the early date of the Synoptic Gospels which starts from the “we” sections in the Acts. I now wish to show what I consider a more probable basis for those Gospels, one that shall account for their general sequence of events, their

half agreements and incomplete statements, while allowing scope for divergencies, additions, and omissions. No mere oral tradition will do this, and the thought that one of the Evangelists had one or both works of the others before him must be dismissed. Mark has been said to have abbreviated Matthew and Luke, but Dr. Abbott has well pointed out how impossible it is that Mark could have picked out in the Gospel story the words common to both those Evangelists, and worked them up into his own inartificial narrative. That idea, therefore, must also be dismissed. But now if the three Gospels are compared in all those passages which are common to the three, we shall find, 1st. That almost the whole of Mark’s Gospel is found contained in the other two; 2nd. That the words which are common to the three Gospels, are the principal words of the narrative or sayings; and 3rd. that, if these words which are common to the three are considered by themselves, they form brief *memorandum* notes. These notes are of just such a kind as an early Christian believer, after the fever of expectation of the Second Advent had abated, would naturally jot down, for his own benefit, and that of his friends. This document would be in Greek, because it is in that language that the identical words are found. It would contain nothing but brief *memorandum* words, and those words probably pretty frequently in an abbreviated form. The document thus imagined has been called “The Triple Tradition.” That this supposed document is not in our hands at the present day, is no argument against its existence at the end of the first century A.D. When once supplanted by our more elaborate Gospels its *raison d’être* would vanish. Our own present New Testament MSS. do not date earlier than the fourth century of our era. The existence of this “Triple Tradition” does not forbid the use by Matthew and Luke, of other and shorter documents, whose use would account for those passages, ten in all, where these two Evangelists only have verbal agreement; neither does it exclude oral tradition, and that elementary instruction in Christianity to which Luke refers in his *exordium*. Our Gospels very probably represent the blending of various sources of information. But what is of present interest is to note that, with the exception of two short paragraphs, which are not found in Matthew and Luke, the whole of Mark’s Gospel is contained, with slight verbal additions, in the other two Synoptists. The general chronological order is, on the whole, the same. Matthew may so handle the “Triple Tradition” as to give a manifestly Jewish flavour to his Gospel; Luke may so treat it, as to give his Gospel a Pauline colouring, while he fails not to show his superior knowledge in correcting the “sea” of Galilee into a “lake,” and his sense of things polite, in changing the common word *κράββατος* “bed,” offensive to ears of good breeding, according to the grammarian Phrynichus, into *κλίνη*, “couch.” But whatever bias or corrections appeared, the *memorandum* document remained as the basis of our present Gospels.

I will endeavour to make my meaning clear by an instance or two. Of the forty-seven sections, according to Reuss, which are common to the three Evangelists, and which are all equally good for my argument, I will take that one which relates to the preparation for the Passover. The parallel passages are found in Mark xiv. 12-16, Matthew xxvi. 17-19, and Luke xxii. 7-13.

With the Greek Testament before me I jot down the translation of those words which are common to the three Evangelists, and I find that it runs as follows:—" . . . of unleavened bread . . . where wilt thou that we make ready . . . eat the passover . . . into the city . . . the master saith . . . the passover . . . with my disciples . . . as unto them . . . they made ready the passover."

Surely here we have what might be rough *memorandum* notes, the backbone of the narrative, so to speak, to be filled up afterwards from memory or from hearsay. If this passage stood alone, it would imply some common foundation, which might be oral tradition; but when we have to weigh the cumulative evidence of forty-seven such sections, covering almost the whole of Mark's Gospel, it appears as if nothing but a common *memorandum* document would meet the exigencies of the case. To oral tradition may be fairly assigned the additions to the narrative which are found chiefly in Matthew and Luke, also what variations there are in the chronological sequence of events, and even the particular colouring which each Evangelist gave to that part of the narrative which they severally reported. But what it does not account for, is the use of identical words running through many chapters and forming the backbone of the narrative. Fortuitous agreement must be put aside as firmly as the gratuitous supposition, now generally discarded, that one or other of the Synoptists used the MS. of the other two.

The most reasonable supposition is that of a *memorandum* containing merely rough notes, which the Evangelists conscientiously worked into their Gospels, according to their bias and their traditional information. The consideration of such a *memorandum* MS. explains the underlying unity of the Gospels amidst many variations and discrepancies. We see it in the section which relates to the preparation for the Passover. We can see it at a glance in the inscription on the Cross, as differently reported by the Evangelists. The memorandum words were simply ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, "the King of the Jews." Each Evangelist amplified them after his fashion as he had done the rest. But we see now what the original tradition was.

Moreover if we can imagine this MS. of rough memorandum notes to have, for brevity sake, some of its words abbreviated, and abbreviations were very common in ancient manuscripts, then it is possible to reconcile such discrepant narratives as the healing of the blind at Jericho, in so far as to show their underlying ground of unity. Let us suppose that such words as "blind," "sat," "hearing," "saying," "him," "cried out," etc., had been abbreviated as they were hastily jotted down, as thus in English:—Jericho . . . multitude . . . blind (τυφλ) . . . sat (καθ) by the way-side . . . hearing (ἀκουσ) . . . Jesus . . . saying (λεγ) . . . Son of David have mercy . . . rebuked him (αὐτ) . . . but cried out (ἐκραζ) . . . Son of David have mercy . . . Jesus stood . . . What wilt thou that I should do . . . may receive (ἀναβλεψ) and followed (ἠκολουθ); then any one can see that, while the words given form the chief part of the narrative, there is plenty of scope for the Evangelists to place the scene at the entrance or at the exit of Jericho, to treat of two blind men, or of one, and even to name that one, according to the local tradition which they combined with the ground plan of the *memorandum* document. It is particularly hard to see how otherwise

with such discrepancies, they still use so many fundamental words in common, while the use of such a MS. appears to solve at once the difficulty.

I anticipate an objection to this document by giving an instance or two of similar brevity found in a traditional work belonging to the Jews of the second century after Christ, the Mishna, whose elliptical style requires expansion before it can be understood. Here is a quotation, according to Dr. Schiller-Szinnessy. ". . . insult or injury belong to her, Rabbi Judah saith . . . hidden two-thirds . . . belong to her, one third to him." This, of course, is incomprehensible, until we supply the key. It concerns damages awarded to a wife for compensation. If the injury inflicted is hidden, two-thirds of the damages recovered belong to her and one-third to her husband. Here is another instance from Dr. Oort, taken out of the Mishna treatise on the Sabbath: "Sabbath outgoings two, giving four, for the in; and two, giving four, for the out." What is the meaning of all this? Dr. Oort fills up this bare outline thus:—"The prohibition to take anything out of, or into, the house on the Sabbath is twofold for him who is within, and twofold for him who is without, and each one of these cases has two sub-cases."

In a voluminous work which began in early Christian times we find such an elliptical style, and in our ancient MSS. we find numerous abbreviations; shall we reject the common memorandum document which lies at the basis of our Synoptical Gospels and forms the "Triple Tradition," because the same characteristics of brevity and obscurity are claimed for it? Is it not, on the other hand, an advantage to account by means of it for the fundamental agreement and the superficial differences which characterise our present Gospels? The probability deserves serious consideration by all scholars.

F. T. P.

P.S.—"Erigena" asks me three questions. I will answer them briefly. I maintain the position I took at the beginning of the debate, viz., that the newly discovered "Teaching of the Apostles," by not pressing upon Christians the reading of the Gospels, by not naming them, and by quoting the Sermon on the Mount traditionally, and not from our present Gospels, *pro tanto* negatives their existence in their present shape. My letter which touched on the subject appeared in the PULPIT on April 19 of this year. In the issue of May 10 following "Erigena's" strictures appeared under the new heading, "When were our Gospels Written?" I was therefore correct in speaking of it as "his self-imposed task." This answers his second question. As for his third question I reply, on the authority of Dr. Major, that the references to παραλυτικὸς are Cels. ii. 1, and iii. 27; Aurelian Morb. Chron. ii. 1, p. 342.

AGNOSTIC TAUNTS.

SIR,—In an article on "Æsthetic Burial" (written by Miss M. Betham-Edwards, which appeared some time since in the *Pall Mall Gazette*) Christians are taunted with inconsistency in reference to the burial of the dead. "Let us," it is stated, "no longer tolerate the nineteenth-century undertaker, so little in keeping with the Christianity of any age or the scientific spirit of our own. It is odd how the hopefulness and faith inculcated by the Christian religion should be thus belied in one of its most solemn ceremonials. Surely

all who believe in the 'world to come and the life everlasting' should put on white robes and garlands instead of crape and sables when bidden to a funeral. . . . In an age of positive science, a generation imbued with the spirit of Darwin, Herbert Spencer, and others, it is high time that we should accompany, and when our own turn comes be accompanied, to the grave after a fashion less meaningless and unbecoming than is at present in vogue." For Christians, professedly so-called, to be rallied thus upon their glaring inconsistency is not a matter of surprise. They have brought it on themselves, and now the tyranny of habit has grown all but too strong to be cast off. It was not so in the early days of Christianity, and even up to the time of Elizabeth. The dead were at least buried as God and nature intended, while the undertaker's profession had not developed the monstrosities it has for long exhibited. In a communication to a daily contemporary, Major-General Smith, referring to "A Mystery of the Tower," takes occasion to rally Englishmen for their execrable taste in mortuary matters. "I have seen," he writes, "hearses and biers in a great many different countries, Christian, Hindoo, and Heathen Chinese, but for hideous comicality I must give the palm to the undertaker of the present day and this Christian land." I take for granted that Major-General Smith was not aware of the efforts put forth by the directory of the London Necropolis to remedy abuses of the character he describes, and would recommend him to witness a funeral ceremony at Brookwood, Surrey, whenever he has an opportunity.

The oldest instance of a wooden coffin is King Arthur's. But the innovation was far from being general. To be buried in winding-sheets and without coffins was the practice of centuries. The extravagant employment of mourning paraphernalia and imperishable coffins argues the decay or absence of that "hopefulness and faith" inculcated by Christianity, as Miss Edwards very properly remarks. However reprehensible the mimic pageantry of the undertaker, and inconsistent the weeds of mourning, assumed for the nonce as a semblance of sorrow, still we could bear with these if no evil results arose in consequence. But our mourning customs have a pernicious tendency, leading oftentimes to much misery in cases where survivors are tempted to show their "respect for the dead" by seriously entrenching upon the pecuniary resources of the future. Then, again, burial in imperishable coffins has occasioned the glaring evils of which cremationists and sanitarians complain, and which render our cemeteries pestiferous and menacing to the public health. Only recently Sir Spencer Wells, in a letter to *The Times*, used the following impressive language: "I repeat my former warning. The public health is endangered by the present mode of burial—not, of course, including earth-to-earth sepulture. The dead are poisoning the living, and if the cholera appears among us we may see something like what may be read with horror in *The Times* about the masses of putrifying corpses in the cemeteries at Naples." Notes of warning have also been sounded by other high medical authorities, and by influential journals. Yet it would appear as though little impression were made upon the public mind. Of course there are a goodly number of persons, many in prominent positions, most desirous of effecting a change for the better, that is to say, to see the earth-to-earth method fully established and in popular favour. Now, as the London cemeteries

must shortly be closed (as it will be impossible to crowd the dead into them much longer), an excellent opportunity of resorting to the ancient old English practice of committing earth to earth is afforded by the existence of Woking Cemetery, the 'virgin soil' of which is admirably adapted for the purpose. Agnostics may well taunt us for our inconsistency as Christians, inasmuch as in the majority of instances the clergyman who officiates at funerals is made to pronounce what is not true. Earth is *not* committed to earth as the burial service declares it to be.

CLERICUS.

ST. SAVIOUR'S PRIORY, a branch house of St. Margaret's Sisterhood, East Grinstead, situated in Great Cambridge Street, Hackney Road, is doing good work among the East London poor. At least we deduce so much from *The Orient*, a quarterly paper issued by the Priory people.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Amies, Rev. N. J. M. S., Curate; Vicar of the Brents, Faversham, Kent.
 Baskett, Rev. John Givens Kirkaldy, B.A., Vicar of Netheravon, Wilts.
 Bolton, Rev. Harry Sandford, Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, Ravenhead.
 Bourne, Rev. Percy W. N., Chaplain of the United Cemeteries of Islington and St. Pancras.
 Brennan, Rev. J. E., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Ramsgate; Vicar of Christ Church, Cheltenham.
 Cross, Rev. John A., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
 Elwyn, Rev. Canon, Vicar of East Farleigh, near Maidstone; Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.
 Gibbs, Rev. Kenneth Francis, M.A., Vicar of Aldenham.
 Guy, Rev. F. B., D.D., Head Master of Forest School, Walthamstow; Canon of St. Albans.
 Harrison, Rev. Edward Henry, M.A., Rector of Bubbenthall; Rector of Ashow.
 Hoskyns, Rev. Edwin, Perpetual Curate of St. Clement, Notting Hill.
 James, Rev. G. L., Vicar of Gresley; Vicar of Gillington.
 Joy, Rev. Dr. Henry, Rector of St. Nicholas, near Cardiff; Rector of Greford, and Curate of Wiltshorpe, Lincolnshire.
 Moorc, Rev. James, B.A., Rector of Etherley, Bishop Auckland; Rector of Penshaw, Fencehouses.
 Nicholls, Rev. Francis H., Vicar of St. Stephen, Canterbury.
 Oliver, Rev. T., Incumbent of St. Martin's, Liverpool; Vicar of Garston.
 Paterson, Rev. Thomas Frederick, M.A., to the New District Chapelry of Herrington.
 Simpson, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Wingate.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beatty, Rev. John, at St. John's Rectory, Bungay, on the 2nd inst.
 Cator, Rev. W. A. B., for nearly forty years Rector of the parish, second son of the late General Sir William Cator, K.C.B., at Stone Court, Carshalton, on the 17th inst.
 Cort, Rev. J. Johnson, M.A., for thirty years Vicar of Sale, at Sale, Cheshire, on the 10th inst., aged 57.
 Haddon, Rev. Thomas Comfield, Incumbent of Tunstal, Norfolk, for forty-five years, at Great Yarmouth, on the 17th inst., aged 83.
 Nantes, Rev. William Hamilton, Rector of Frome Vauchurch and Balcombe, Dorset, and for twenty-eight years Vicar of East Stonehouse, Plymouth, at Tenby, on the 13th inst., aged 74.
 Shaw, Rev. W. Elliott, B.A., at Wyvenhoe, on the 17th inst., aged 59.
 Sweeting, Rev. Alfred, M.A., twenty-three years Rector of Amcotts, at Amcotts Rectory, Doncaster, on the 17th inst., aged 53.
 Wight, Rev. William, M.A., at the Arab's Tent, Chislehurst, on the 16th inst., aged 74.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF NIGHT.

BY CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL ON
SUNDAY, AUGUST 3, 1884.

"Thou hast proved and visited mine heart in the night season."—PSALM xvii. 3.

THERE is no necessary contrast such as is sometimes supposed to exist between what are called the scientific and the religious views of nature. Science keeps its eye upon the facts of nature as they come before it; it carefully verifies and measures them; it endeavours to discover their exact relations to each other; it sees in each of them a fragment of that vast universe that surrounds us, and of which each one of us forms a part. The man of science delights to trace each fact, feature, and occurrence in nature back to some law, some cause, some antecedent as its immediate parent, and, so far, its explanation. For him each fact has its discoverable, or, it may be, its undiscoverable yet certain place and function in that outward, unrelaxing, unceasing movement which transcends the divisions of time and the vicissitudes of individual being, and growth and decay, and life and death. Each ripple on the surface of the mighty current, each phase of the swiftly changing being that presents itself only to disappear into the dark, unexplored background of what seems to be merely matter and force—each has for science the highest interest, and science, as such, has in it no interest beyond. But it is otherwise with religion. Religion, too, is interested in nature; for is not nature a revelation, partial and inadequate, yet still a revelation, of the Being whose handiwork it is? Religion is interested in nature; but behind each natural fact, feature, and occurrence, religion sees not only or chiefly the immediate physical antecedent or cause of it, but Him to whom both effect and cause are alike traceable. And since He is not merely the first of all causes, not merely the first of all intelligences, but a moral Being, whose justice and whose love and interest in the creatures whom He has made, that they may know and love Him, are equal to His intelligence and His power, religion sees in nature, sees in its sterner as well as its more tender moods, in its storm and calm, in its rain and drought, in its cloud and sunshine, in its day and night, not mere phenomena, as they are scientifically apprehended, but successive and

vivid expressions of the awful and beautiful character of the great Being beyond.

Science points its telescopes to heaven, and calculates, with admirable and unerring precision, the distance of a sun, or the speed at which a planet will accomplish its orbit, and the remote date at which a comet will again become visible, while religion chants the even sublimer truth—"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. There is neither speech nor language; but their voices are heard among them. Their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words into the end of the earth." There is an outbreak of Vesuvius, and science forthwith busies itself with the strength and the direction of the volcanic forces which are thus known to be in movement beneath the crust of the earth. Or a storm of exceptional violence bursts upon our shores, and new efforts are made to refer it to some cycle of atmospheric disturbance which is as yet imperfectly recognised; but religion the while utters her warning that God's voice is uttered in nature; that He has some message, be it what it may, for the moral and human world, that He is making the flames of fire to be His ministers; that His way is in the sea and His paths in deep waters, though His footsteps be unknown; that He is making the clouds His chariot, and walking on the wings of the wind. Or some destroying epidemic, like cholera, is striking panic into the populations of great countries, and science is busying herself in the kindly and most useful task of discovering the insect, the germ, the bacillus, the bacterium, which propagates the disorder, and, if she may, of summarily dealing with it; while religion is equally prepared either for her triumph or her failure, since the event, in any case, is from God. To science the human frame itself suggests the chemistry or the anatomy of our great schools of medicine; religion ascends to the mysterious region beyond, in which life and that mystery, the transmission of life, is traced up to its first, its only source:—"Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect; and in thy book were all my members written, which day by day were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

And between these ways of looking at nature there is—I repeat it—no necessary contradiction. Contradiction only arises when religious men hint that accurate scientific observation may be what it never can be—dangerous to religion; or when scientific men abandon observation for rash hypothesis, or press conclusions derived from sensible observation into spheres of thought and being where they are plainly out of place. And the two states of mind do not belong to two different stages of civilisation. Religion is more necessary to us men than science, and, therefore, in the order of time, God has taught us religion first of all; but the two ways of looking at nature may

coincide harmoniously in the same age and in the same mind—nay, the one may stimulate and minister to the other. Science, by its revelations, does but enhance in our minds the splendour, the mystery of Him who is beyond those revelations; and when religion names nature as a book of God she consecrates every effort of science to interpret it. The succession of day and night, and of work and rest, will illustrate what I am saying. Physically speaking, we all know night is the result of a revolution of the planet which we inhabit, whereby the spot which we happen to occupy is for some hours turned away from the sun. But if we look on this world as the dwelling-place of man—the one being on its surface who has conscious relations with its Maker—it is evident that night, whatever be the independent physical or astronomical account of it, must have another and a higher meaning; and this, its higher meaning and purpose, is hinted at in the exclamation of the psalmist—"Thou hast proved and visited mine heart in the night season."

The religious aspects of night are many. We will try to consider three of them. Night, then, viewed in its relations to the life of man, strikes us, first of all, and pre-eminently, as an interruption. It breaks in upon and suspends human occupation of whatever kind; it writes on the face of the heavens the veto of God on uninterrupted work. By it the Great Ruler of the universe interferes periodically, that His creatures may economise the limited supply of strength with which He has endowed them. At the very least, eight hours in the twenty-four, a quarter of a century in the life of a man of 75—I am, of course, here greatly understating the case—are withdrawn, are rescued by night from the grasping demands of competitive labour; and as each day the shadow of night creeping around the surface of the world advances from village to village, from city to city, from country to country, from continent to continent, from east to west, millions of human workers hail the approaching pause in toil which is thus mercifully imposed upon them. At night's approach, indeed, "the wild animals roaring after their prey do seek their meat from God, and the sun ariseth, and they get them away together, and lay them down in dens;" but man's prerogative and rule it is, when his life has not been distorted by artificial civilisation, that he "goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening." We are so accustomed ourselves, we take the familiar features of our life so much for granted, that we probably fail, at first, to see anything noteworthy in the interruption of work by the recurrence of night; and yet conceivably, at least, it might have been ordered otherwise. Man might conceivably have been so fashioned as to be a continuously working being, exposed to no such regulated interruption. And this enforced suspension of activity cannot but suggest a meaning. It suggests not merely the

limited stock of strength at our disposal, which thus needs to be often and regularly refreshed and replenished, but it also reminds us that we have a higher life than that which is represented and made the most of by the activity of this life, which will last when all that belongs to this shall have passed away—a life for the nutriment and development of which God thus makes provision, or invites us to make provision, lest we should be swept without thought, without purpose, down the stream of time into the vast eternity that awaits us.

No doubt the natural rule is in our modern world largely, perhaps inevitably, modified in the great centres of human activity. Gas and electricity are now the servants of us men, and they have gone far to make us, as we may think, independent of the light of the sun. Certainly, there are times in the year when it is easy here in London to forget that we have any relations to the sun at all; and this helps forward the unnatural practice of turning night into day for purposes of toil as well as for purposes of pleasure, which obtains increasingly, as it is to be feared, among us. Against this some recent efforts are a protest, which seem to deserve our warm sympathy. The Early Closing Movement, as it is called, is an attempt to recover the rest and leisure which, by God's appointment, are given with nightfall for the sons of toil from the ever increasing demands of competition; and on the success of this movement the health and well-being, physical and moral, of thousands of young people of both sexes in this metropolis, and in other great centres of industry, very largely depend. And yet at the worst our modern life of high pressure only innovates, within limits, upon the appointment of God in nature. The streets may be lighted through the long hours of the winter night; but as the hours pass, the sounds of busy human life do die gradually away, and little, at last, is to be heard save the footfall of the policeman, or the striking of some clock that marks the advance of time. Man obeys, at last, the summons of night—late, but at last, he withdraws from the importunities of his busy existence for that re-invigoration of his strength which comes with rest. Does he withdraw for any other and higher purpose as well? Night, it has been said, is an interruption; it is in this like illness—it obliges us to pause that we may take the measure of what we are doing, and of what we are. It suggests that this busy world, with its incessant preoccupations, is not our all; that there is one Being who infinitely transcends it, and who is hidden from our sight by its great and petty cares, by its engrossing pleasures, by its varied and exhausting demands upon our little stock of thought and strength. Oh! it is in mercy that He thus bids us take note that if we do forget Him, He all the while is here, more powerful, wiser, fairer, immeasurably, than any beneath His throne, and more worthy far

of the best efforts of our understanding, of the truest homage of our hearts.

And, again, night suggests danger. The daylight is of itself protection. When daylight is withdrawn much becomes possible which it forbids. Night is the opportunity of wild beasts and of evil men; they ply their trade during its dark and silent hours. And thus St. Paul describes the workers of darkness as "unfruitful," and the thief to whose stealthy approach our Lord compares the unexpectedness of His second coming is "a thief in the night." If, indeed, St. Paul were to visit London on the afternoon of a Bank Holiday, it is to be feared that he would have to reconsider his remark, based upon the observation of only pagan cities, that "they that be drunken are drunken in the night." But, at any rate, it is still true upon the whole that night is the appropriate and recognised season of peril and disaster. Nor is imagination the parent of the idea, since imagination does but dwell upon and realise in detail what experience has taught before. It may, indeed, be thought that this estimate of night belongs only to a rude and uncivilised stage of human life, when society and law are still in their infancy, when order is imperfectly recognised, when crimes and violence are necessarily frequent. Why should we pray God, it has been asked, "to lighten our darkness," when our streets are brilliant from sunset to sun-rise with gas or electricity? Why beg that of His great mercy He would "protect us from all perils and dangers of this night," when with this very object of protection the City and the Metropolitan Police are so admirably organised? Whether our lighted streets and our police force do actually, or under any circumstances avail altogether to arrest the activities of criminal violence is a question which we need not here discuss; but there is one form of nightly danger—the creation of civilisation itself—against which, we must often and sadly reflect, no human care will absolutely insure our safety. Most certain it is that if civilisation enriches us with one hand, she often, with the other, neutralises her gift; her science which gives man's benevolence such astonishing command over nature, also arms his passions, as we know too well, with new and terrific means for destroying life; her medicine, which soothes pain with so many a subtle anodyne, yet prolongs physical existence under conditions when to exist is necessarily to suffer. For there is a lofty and an equal justice which measures out to the successive generations of men a more equal share of the goods and ills of life than the unlikeness of their outward circumstances would at first lead us to suppose. And, so, if in some respects night is less perilous for us than it was for our rude forefathers, in others it is more so. In the lofty and often densely inhabited houses which frank the thoroughfares of a great city like this there is an enemy who may make his appearance when

we least suspect. It was not difficult for simple men who dwelt in tents or in rude cabins to escape from the ravages of fire. We do not often hear that the tenants of a shepherd's hut had been burned in their beds; but when long and intricate passages, and many flights of stairs, have to be traversed ere the old or the sick, whom a most stifling, scorching burst of flame and smoke has just roused from their midnight slumber, can reach a place of safety, the event will too probably be fatal. Only last spring, in the tragedy which occurred in the Old Bailey, not three hundred yards from this Cathedral, we saw how powerless civilisation may be, when in command of its most effective resources, against the deadly ravages of fire. It is with civilised as with savage man—he has in the last resort only one protector: He who gave us life can alone guarantee to us the permanence of the gift, since He can order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, and can control the destructive force of nature, and the sequence of events. "My time is in Thy hand." "I will lay me down in peace, and sleep; for Thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety."

And a third aspect of the night is, that it is a time during which God often speaks solemnly to the soul of man. Certainly night is a season of sleep; but the sleep of the body is not wholly and always the sleep of the soul. Often we carry into sleep the thoughts and aims, the passions and aspirations, the terrors and anxieties of our waking hours; we traverse it in a condition of broken or half-suspended consciousness. This faculty of the soul is active while another is dormant; this truth or fact is clearly perceived while another is lost sight of, or it is distorted into some horrible or grotesque caricature of the reality. Sometimes the mind is hopelessly passive; sometimes it is unnaturally energetic, controlled for one moment by the severest exercise of the judgment, only that the next it may become the prey of the wildest freaks of the fancy. How familiar to all of us are the experiences of sleep! Yet how little do we really know of that strange border land between the world of sense and the world of spirits! Most assuredly to ascribe a dream to indigestion is in no way to account for the form the dream takes; no disorder of the bodily organs can possibly explain the subtle variety of intellectual and moral agitation which often enters into a single dream—those vague and dreadful apprehensions, that awful soul-appalling spectre, those terrible moments of suspense, those sharp spasms of agony, those ineffable ecstasies, playing as they do in swift succession upon every note upon the vast keyboard of the human soul. When Lord Bolingbroke, the deist, is arguing against Revelation, he makes the important admission that it is in reason impossible to deny that Almighty God may, if He wills, communicate His mind and will to a human soul. No believer in God's existence

can reasonably deny it; although how spirit may communicate spirit—the infinite Spirit of God with the finite spirit of man—who of us men shall dare to say? But if we cannot explain how a process takes place, that is no reason for denying that it may or does take place, and the action of God upon the human soul is not more mysterious than it is certain—just as are numberless other facts such as the action of the human soul upon the muscles of the body, facts within and facts around us, matters of hard experience, yet defying all our efforts to explain or analyse them.

If God can communicate at pleasure with the soul of man, bearing in upon it thoughts and affections, influences which move the understanding, influences which move the will, He may do so in states of half-consciousness, as well as in states of full consciousness; He may make a dream, as well as a sudden intuition of the reason in a man's waking hours, the vehicle of His mind and His will. The Bible tells us that He has done so again and again. The dreams of Pharaoh's servants, which were interpreted by Joseph; the dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, which were interpreted by Daniel; the dreams of our Lord's foster-father, revealing to him the high honour put upon his virgin spouse, and bidding him take her and the Divine Child into Egypt; the dreams of St. Paul, when the angel of the Lord stood by him in the midst of the Mediterranean storm and bade him fear not, since he would live to be brought before Cæsar, and assuring him that God had given him all the companions of his voyage to his prayers—these are cases in point. If the Bible is to guide us, there can be no doubt that dreams have often been made the vehicle of communication of the Divine will to man, and that it leads us to expect that they may be so again. No doubt there is room enough for delusion in such a matter as this; and in religious books we are often warned against attaching importance to dreams, as being a form of superstition; and Bishop Ken prays—

Let no ill dreams disturb my rest;

and a greater hymn-writer than he, and an older one—

Let dreams depart and visions fly, the offspring of the night.

And the reason for this is that during sleep God and good angels are not the only beings who may possibly act upon the half-passive soul. Other spirits most assuredly there are, subtle and malignant, who may, within prescribed limits, disturb and mislead us. Their activity is, at any rate, a reason for not attaching too much importance to any dream, unless in our waking hours we are satisfied that it is in accordance with what we know independently of the will of God. Certainly it must be within the experience of many of us that there are cases in modern life in which it is difficult not to think that, as of old, God speaks to

the human soul thus in sleep, warning, encouraging, directing, invigorating it, echoing in the hours of sleep the lessons which conscience has proclaimed by day, and perchance notifying to it some truth or fact unknown before, to be verified not long after by experience. Of many such visitations as these, as we look back at them, we may surely and reverently say, "Thou hast proved and visited mine heart in the night season."

But it is not in dreams that God generally speaks to man in the silent hours of the night. We are accustomed to think of sleeplessness as a great misfortune; and no doubt for men who have to use their brains or their limbs by day the absence of sleep at night is a very serious trouble: it deprives us of the refreshment of body and mind which is needful for effective work. And yet sleeplessness may be a very great blessing, if only we think of it, first as part of the will of God respecting us, and next as opening to us many opportunities. Never does God speak more solemnly, more persuasively, to the human soul than during the waking hours of the night. We are alone, it may be, in the dark, yet in full possession of ourselves and of all our faculties; we are alive, as really as during the busy hours of daylight, to the solemnities of existence; and within us is a voice which speaks for God incessantly, only during the hours of business and of pleasure it is silenced by the many-tongued clamour around us, or its lessons are forgotten amid the distraction of a thousand competing interests. In the silent night conscience has its chance, conscience speaks and we listen; we hear no other voice; conscience revives the past, and the eye of sense rests upon no object which can compete with and efface the awful impression. The past rises at the bidding of conscience—it rises as from the dead; neglected opportunities, the unresisted sins, the disregarded warnings, the profound degradations; they rise all of them, pressing eagerly, one after another, for distinct recognition by the terrified eye of the soul. Conscience often seems to inspire its faithful attendant, memory, with a weird and supernatural activity; and what was for long years forgotten reappears with every circumstance of contemporary distinctness, so that time and sequence have vanished, and the soul sees its whole history at a glance. And thus it is that the unseen is felt to be what it always is—near and importunate; thus it is that the duties of time are, for the moment, illuminated by the light of eternity, and we listen to the awful undertone of all human existence, and the troops of the angels who execute the will of the Highest sweep around us with a vehemence which is almost sensible, and in our ears the voices of the dead, whom we have known long since on earth, sound with a plaintive and incessant monotony, while a new world of practical thought and resolution steadily thrusts itself upon us. Then it is that religion asserts its empire, and

we acknowledge to ourselves with sorrow how much we have overlooked, or forgotten, or despised, or set aside, that had the first of all claims upon us. For above all else One there is whom hereafter we shall see with the eye of the flesh ; and even now in these, the preliminaries of His judgment, His voice seems to say to us, "For thee I left the glories of my heavenly throne ; for thee I took upon Me a servant's form, and the life of toil and hardship ; for thee I endured the spittle and the scorn, and the nails and the spear, and the lingering torture of the cross, and the sharpness of death. What hast thou done, what art thou doing for Me ?"

Yes ; it is true now, as of old, that night has its solitary, its priceless opportunities. Not a few men living can date a complete change in the whole direction and purpose of life from the agony and struggle which those silent hours have witnessed when, like the patriarch, they wrestled in prayer, with the Giver of Pardon and the Source of Strength, and have at last prevailed. Then, as at other times, all the lower instincts of nature are against the more generous aspirations of the soul ; but then, beyond other times, it is true that "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." "Every night," says a penitent, "wash I my bed and water my couch with my tears." "In the night," cries another, "I commune with my own heart, and search out my spirit." "In the night season, also," exclaims the great sufferer in the prophecy, "I take no rest ; but Thou continuest holy, O Thou Worship of Israel." "I have thought," protests an exile, "upon Thy name, O Lord, in the night season, and I have kept Thy law." "At midnight," he resolves, "I will rise to give thanks unto Thee." And why ? "Because of Thy righteous judgment." And another solemnly exclaims, "Ye that by night stand in the house of the Lord, in the courts of the house of our God, lift up your hands in the sanctuary, and praise the Lord." Each of these men most assuredly could lift his eyes to heaven and could say with another, "Thou hast proved and visited my heart in the night season."

One practical lesson, at least, may be remembered as bearing upon this subject—the duty of storing the mind, while we are yet comparatively young and strong, with that which in the hours of sleeplessness and pain will enable us to rise up to God. The seven Psalms of penitence, the 6th, the 32nd, the 38th, the 51st, the 102nd, the 130th, and the 143rd, will give full expression to what all Christians feel, or ought to feel, about much in their past lives. The *Te Deum* is at once praise and prayer, and there is so much in every single phrase of it that it will occupy a believing Christian (so said one who spoke from long experience) "during the greater part of an entirely sleepless night." And then the collects in the prayer-book cover the whole range of our spiritual needs ; and

to have learned them in early childhood, and thus to be able to fall back upon them throughout life in the night, may be an untold blessing. A mind well stored with Holy Scripture, with good prayers and hymns, need never feel that the waking hours of the night are lost ; they may do more for the soul's true sanctification and peace than any others in this our brief earthly pilgrimage.

God grant that some of us may be able to utter a Christian's echo to the Psalmist's words: "Thou, O Lord Jesus, Thou in Thy condescending love again and again hast proved and visited this poor heart of mine in the night season ; and now, though all unworthy, it is Thine, purchased by Thy blood, consecrated by Thy spirit, renewed and invigorated by Thy sacraments, drawn and knit by bands of Thine own making to Thy blessed Self—Thyself the everlasting home and prize of the lowest as of the highest of Thy redeemed."

CHRIST THE WAY TO THE FATHER.

BY THE REV. DR. TAIT, INCUMBENT OF TRINITY CHURCH, PAU.

A SERMON PREACHED IN ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL, EDINBURGH, ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 21ST, 1884.

"And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the land until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst. And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, He said, Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit. And when He had said thus, He gave up the ghost."—ST. LUKE xxiii. 44-46.

THE text speaks of "the Temple." That sacred edifice, as we all know, was the abode of Deity under the dispensation of Moses. We also know what its three compartments were. There was the outer court, containing the altar of sacrifice and the laver of brass. There was the holy place, whose entire furniture was gold. It contained the table of shew-bread, the seven-branched candlestick, and the altar of incense. And there was the holiest of all, where God sat enthroned, in solitary majesty, between the Cherubim.

The text speaks also of "the veil of the Temple." That veil hung on four pillars at the entrance of the Holiest, and served the purpose of a door. A Father chides a rebellious son severely for his evil behaviour and wicked ways ; He then leaves him in token of His high displeasure, retires to his own chamber, and bolts the door. Such was the veil of the Temple. It was God's bolted door. It marked His displeasure with the sin of man. And it remained bolted for 1,500 years.

The rebellious son of whom we have spoken knocks at his father's closed door, and prays for entrance. But there is no response. So it was with this door of the Holiest. Neither the faithfulness of Moses, nor the piety of Samuel, nor the

zeal of Elijah prevailed to open it. It could not be opened till "the fulness of the time" should come. "The way into the Holiest of all was not made manifest while the first Tabernacle was yet standing" (Heb. ix. 8).

Some one might have tried to open it. He might have said, I am a son of Abraham, circumcised the eighth day, and in solemn covenant with the God of Israel. I am resolved to go in and speak with Him, to lay before Him all my wants and wishes, to seek His counsel in my difficulties, His consolation in my sorrows. And so speaking, he might have drawn aside the veil and essayed to enter in. He would have been struck dead on the instant. Whatever the patience of God may suffer now, no trifling with holy things was permitted then. "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy."

All this explains the text, and that in the most wonderful manner. Let us translate it into simpler language. It was about twelve o'clock, and there was a darkness over the whole land till three o'clock, the sun's light failing, Three o'clock passed on to five. "Jesus cried with a loud voice, Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." It was the last utterance of the dying Saviour. "Having said thus, He gave up the ghost."

The priests, meanwhile, were in the holy place, retired and secluded from the awful uproar of the city. They were engaged, doubtless, in their sacred duties. They had ordered the holy bread on the golden table in the morning; and now, as enjoined by Moses for the evening, they were lighting the lamps of the golden candlestick, and burning incense on the golden altar. Suddenly they were startled as by a clap of thunder. "The veil of the Temple was rent in the midst." Or, as St. Matthew puts it more fully, it "was rent in twain, from the top to the bottom." And the glory of the God of Israel shining through the rent, lighted up the robes of the priesthood, and bathed in its uncreated effulgence the furniture of the sacred chamber!

We can conceive the consternation which followed, but no language can express it. "All faces would be turned into paleness." One priest would ask of his fellow, trembling like himself, "Who has done this?" But he would receive no answer. It could not be man who had done it, for there was no man in that chamber but themselves. Besides, the rending was "from the top." And no human hand could have reached the top of that lofty dome. God Himself must have done it, He whose glory was now dazzling His astonished ministers, He who had on that day caused the sun's light to fail, and brought darkness over all the land. But why had He done it? The meaning of the darkness was plain. It told of wrath—the wrath which man's sin had awakened. The sun refused to look upon the awful deed of

Calvary. Did this rending then tell of wrath also? No; it told of love, it told of forgiving mercy. It was the Father's door unbolted—unbolted by his own hand. It was His gracious countenance beaming through that opened door, and inviting man to come to Him. The invitation was "to the Jew first," "from the top." It was "also to the Gentile," "to the bottom." As we read in the Book of Psalms, "Praise waiteth for Thee, O God, in Zion." And again, "Oh, Thou that hearest prayer, to Thee shall all flesh come" (lxv. 1, 2). As we read also in the Prophets, "I was found of them that sought Me not, I was made manifest to them that asked not after Me" (Romans x. 20). The rent veil thus contains in it the whole Gospel, the full exposition of that blessed word of Jesus, "God so loved the world." That apostles so regarded it, we may learn from their own words. They speak of "boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus." They declare this as "a new and living way which He has consecrated for us through the veil." And they sound abroad the word of blessed encouragement, "Let us draw near" (Heb. x. 19-22).

This boldness, it is specially to be noted, is "by the blood of Jesus." We read in Leviticus xvii. 11, "It is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life that is in it. This was why it was "not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin." The life that was in such blood, was that of an unintelligent, worthless animal. Neither was it possible that human blood should take it away. "No man," it is written, "may redeem his brother, or give unto God a ransom for him; the redemption of the soul is precious, he must let that alone for ever" (Psalm xlix. 7-9). For the life that is in such blood is merely creature-life; it is moreover stained with sin. What God demanded was life that was at once precious and perfectly holy. And He obtained His demand in Jesus. Let us listen to the voice from Heaven. "Thou art my beloved Son," declared its preciousness; "in whom I am well pleased," declared its holiness. This precious and holy life was in the blood of Calvary. And so that blood prevailed to take away the sin of the world. Well might it do so. It was the blood of Deity (Acts xx. 28). It was the blood, moreover, of One "who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth" (1 Peter ii. 21).*

* I have given the above rendering of Leviticus xvii. 11 on the authority of Professor Robertson Smith. It appears to me of great value, especially as coming from so distinguished a Hebrew scholar. It is very striking to observe the different way in which Atonement is presented by many modern divines from that in which it was presented in the beginning by inspired Apostles. The former speak of the amount of suffering endured, the latter spake of the dignity of Him who endured it. The sermons of St. Peter, on Pentecost and in the house of Cornelius, and the sermon of St. Paul at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii.), are examples of what I mean. Suffering was necessarily present in the

This leads to another thought. Atonement, in its very essence, is the giving up of life to God. He sought a double life, the life of the spirit, and also the life of the body. The former was His due from man, the latter was forfeited to His law. The Lord Jesus rendered both to Him, and that in full measure. The life of the spirit is obedience prompted by love.—“Christ Jesus,” says St. Paul, “was obedient as far as death” (Philip. ii. 4, 8). And He Himself has told us why He was so. “That the world may know that I love the Father, as He gave me commandment even so I do,” were His few but solemn words as He left the upper room to die (John xiv. 31). For the death of the cross did indeed demand love, “with all the heart and soul, and strength and mind.” It demanded love to man also, else it never could have been endured. “Hereby perceive we love,” says St. John, “He laid down His life for us” (1 John iii. 16). The whole law, in both its tables, was thus fulfilled on Calvary. The Son of God took our human life for this high and holy end. He knew that life to be forfeited when He took it. And so, having taken it, He laid it down, “He died for our sins, and was buried” (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4). The penalty of the law was honoured as well as its holy precept. And when the law was thus magnified, the law-giver was “well pleased” (Isaiah xlii. 21).

We see all this in the arrangements of the temple. The lid of the ark formed the mercy seat. And within that ark, underneath that lid, were the precious tables of the law. God did not give these tables to the priests to keep, He kept them Himself, within the holiest. “For it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the Law to fail.” And so, when they were fulfilled at once in precept and in penalty, God rent with His own hand “from the top to the bottom” the sacred veil of the holiest; and looking through the rent with His own countenance of love, He invited man to come to Him.

It still remains to ask, how near may we venture to come? Had such a question been asked under the dispensation of Moses, we know well the answer which the sacred authorities would have returned. Are you a Jew, they would have said, one of the covenant people? You may enter, then, into the outer court. But do not venture nearer: Uzziah the king was smitten with leprosy for venturing into the holy place. But perhaps you are a priest. Then the holy place is open to you. But do not, we beseech you, venture nearer. Nadab and Abihu were consumed with fire—fire which crossed the very mercy seat to reach them—for entering the holiest unbidden. It is open to

the high-priest alone, and to you if that dignity belongs to you, but only once a year. They needed not to add, do not venture nearer. Nearer was impossible. The high priest, as he stood within the holiest, was face to face with God.

Human society may in part, explain this. There are three degrees of nearness to man—that of the servant, the friend, and the child. Let us look at the household of our Queen. She has her servants. They must come near her person, or they could not discharge their duties. But it is the nearness of servants only. She has also her friends who sit at her table, and whom she honours with friendly intercourse. But it is the nearness of friends only. Neither servants nor friends are like her own sons and daughters. Even so it is with the King of Heaven, He has His servants, His friends, and His children. The Jews under the law, were His servants. And there was one before the law, whom He honoured as never man was honoured, in calling him, “Abraham, my friend.” But we in Christ have received the place of children, and “He sends forth into our hearts the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father!” This is entrance into the holiest indeed: to come nearer to the Blessed One than as a child to a father, is impossible. We learn this from our Lord Himself. Even in Gethsemane, when on the eve of His passion, “He offered prayers and supplications with strong cryings and tears,” He had no more endearing name for the Blessed One above than Abba, Father, oh my Father!

But may we venture without impious presumption, to draw near to God as He did? We may thus venture, and need not fear to be repelled. For we are led by His hand and sheltered under His wing. Has He not said “when ye pray, say, Our Father?” Has He not also given us the reason which sanctions such exceeding boldness, He is “my Father and your Father?” Such liberty of access, and nothing less, is the blessed Gospel of the grace of God.

“Let us then draw near, and in full assurance of faith.” Let us tell our Father above, what our sins and sorrows are. Let us spread our cares and anxieties before Him. Let us ask His protection in danger, His counsel and guidance in difficulty. Let us ask Him for our children; let us ask Him for our friends; let us ask Him for His holy Church; let us ask Him for our country; let us ask Him for humanity itself. He will not weary of our importunity, but hear and answer, above what we can ask or think. His dear Son has said, “The Father Himself loveth you; ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.”

sacrifices of the Jewish Law. But it was not the suffering which atoned. What prevailed to atone was the surrender of life. If then we honestly hold the divinity of the Saviour, we need not ask wherein the power of His atonement lay. Divine life was surrendered on Calvary.

—♦—
We are requested to contradict the statement that the Rev. J. E. Brenan, Vicar of Christ Church, Ramsgate, has been appointed to Christ Church, Cheltenham.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months 5s. 6d. twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1884.

CHURCH DEFENCE.

THE question of disestablishment, and also the necessity for Church defence, again brought before the minds of churchmen by the letter which Mr. Gladstone has addressed to the Bishop of St. Asaph—which was read at the Diocesan Conference, and which has since appeared in all the daily papers—following as it does the debate at the Carlisle Congress on the “Advantage of an Established Church,” when able and interesting papers were read by the Bishop of Winchester, the Earl of Carnarvon, Mr. Stanley Leighton and others, is of significant importance; and although there does not seem any immediate probability of its being brought before the Legislature, yet we must not forget that the emissaries of the Liberation Society are steadily pursuing their work, and will never rest satisfied until they have brought about this (with them) much desired object. We know from past experience that they oppose every effort which shall make the Church more acceptable to the people, and the motions of which Mr. Richard, Mr. Dillwyn, and others, have from time to time given notice have all one object in view, viz., to bring about sooner or later disestablishment and disendowment. Inasmuch as we know that this is their great object, it behoves churchmen of all shades of opinion to unite together and show a determined front, and to concert plans for effective Church defence. For many years we have had in existence the Church Defence Institution, which has done a good work in the publication of such useful and interesting works as the “Englishman’s Brief,” and if we may trust the columns of their publication, *The National Church*, much useful work is still being carried on through their instrumentality; and the publication of another book entitled

“The Dead Hand in the Free Churches,” will have helped to clear away the mists from the eyes of many who have only partially understood the history of their own church, and to show them that all is not so fair and pleasing as those who are opposed to the Church are apt to make out, and that there are grave flaws and blemishes among those who are “Free” and not under State control, as they assert that we are. While the Church Defence Institution has done good service in bringing to light things upon which many churchmen were ignorant, and has sent forth able and accomplished lecturers to discuss the question with the lecturers of the Liberation Society, and to show up the falsity and weakness of many of their statements, we are afraid that there still exists a great deal of ignorance with regard to the history of the Church of England, especially in rural districts, in which if disestablishment should come it will be felt with the greatest severity. The great mass of the people know very little about the history of their Church; they have the church in their midst, they have the vicar or rector, who visits them, takes an interest in the schools, and whose influence they feel in many and various ways; they pay their tithes and attend the services, and yet if some of them were asked to state what was the difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, or the various forms of dissent, they could not give an intelligent answer. It may be thought that we have overdrawn the picture and made the rural churchgoer to appear worse than he really is; but let anyone ask a parishioner of a rural, or even semi-rural parish, any of these questions and see what answer he will get; and so also with regard to the history of the Church. To alter this state of things it is evident that we want what an eminent divine of our Church said some years ago, “more teaching and less preaching”—series of instructive but not controversial lectures, although if it should happen that questions are asked the lecturer should be ready to answer them. And we believe it would greatly help on the work if the clergy themselves would do this instead of getting strangers for the purpose, as it would enable them to keep “touch” with their people, and also keep abreast of the controversies of the day. And so, with effective teaching from the pulpit and lectures in the week, much may be done to counteract the pernicious influence of the liberationists, who are scattering their tracts and pamphlets broadcast all over the land. Closely allied to this question of Church Defence there is also that of Church Reform. It is true that there never was a time when the Church was so much alive to her duty and responsibility as at the present time, as witness the ever-increasing works which are promoted to make men realise the fact that the Church exists for them, and that they must do their part in the work. But there does need reform in some departments, for instance the

intricate question of the Ecclesiastical Courts, the existence of pluralities in certain forms, not to mention other things; yet these we trust will be altered in time, and while others hold up the finger of scorn at us on account of some of these things, we know full well that this ridicule is intended by them to bring about disestablishment. And yet with regard to the Church, although she may have some flaws, we would feel inclined to say, "With all thy faults (how few they are) I love thee still," or as the late Dr. Cumming said once, when speaking of the Church of England, "Look at it as a whole, and put your finger on the little blots that you may see," and so we would say with all the power that we are capable of, "Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it." The words of the Premier will we hope, stir up all to greater zeal on behalf of the Church, that "disestablishment would be disgraceful if it were due to the neglect, indifference, or deadness of the Church," and, "it might also be disgraceful were it to arrive as a consequence of the dissensions among the members of the Church." Of the first there is little fear, and if clergymen in country parishes will but instruct their flocks in the doctrine, discipline, and history of the Church, they will be able to give a reason for the hope that is in them. Of the latter statement we believe that a great deal may be done to heal up divisions and dissensions if men would only try to see in how many things they can agree, at the same time not giving up any principle, and learn the rule: In things doubtful, liberty; in things essential, unity; in all things, charity.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"VIRTUALISM." WHAT IS IT?

SIR,—A query on this subject was sent, though not by me, to a contemporary Church paper a few weeks ago. The editor replied that Ancient Councils were not even patient of it. I wrote inquiring what Ancient Councils had said on the subject, and asking for half a column of its space, offering to defend "Virtualism" by quotations from Bertram, Cranmer, Ridley, Jackson, Sutton, Jeremy Taylor, Cosin, and Bull. The only reply I had was in the notices to Correspondents, to the effect that "Virtualism" is heresy, and that Bertram is only another name for Scotus Erigena; and further, that Cranmer and Ridley's names were enough to stamp as heretical anything they said. Now, perhaps, some of your readers may ask what "Virtualism" really is. I reply that it is the contrary of a gross corporeal local presence of our Lord's body in the Eucharist. He who denies "Virtualism," must hold a corporeal presence, whether this presence is caused by extension, multiplication, swift motion, as Newman taught, or by His body not being bound by laws of place, space, etc., as the pervert Dalgairns pretends, giving Thomas Aquinas as his authority. As to Bertram and Scotus Erigena being one and the same person, Jeremy

Taylor and Burnet make them different, and by them I will be guided till I hear further. But that is a matter of little consequence. I come now to my authorities.

1. Bertram says, "That which is outwardly seen hath a corporeal, real nature, which feeds the body; that which is understood to be contained within it hath a spiritual fruit or virtue, and quickeneth the soul" (p. 207, Dublin Ed., 1753). Again, "The elements, while in one respect, they continue bread and wine, are, in another respect by spirit and potency, the body and blood of Christ, even as the element of water is endued with a spiritual power in order to the sacrament of Baptism." What Bertram really meant is further seen from Parchasius's description of his doctrine, "They denied the presence of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament, but held an invisible power and efficacy in and with the elements" (p. 113).

2. Ridley says, "I confess Christ's natural body to be in the Sacrament, indeed, by spirit and grace," and again, "by grace and efficacy:" "but if you would include a lively and moveable body under the forms of bread and wine, then in that sense, is *not* Christ's body in the Sacrament really and indeed."

3. I should now quote Cranmer. But what would that avail? He is pronounced a heretic as well as myself. So I pass on to one who can be scarcely so designated.

4. Bishop Cosin. He says, "Christ, from heaven, reacheth down to us the divine virtue of His flesh." Mark, not from the altar, but from heaven; also not His natural body, but the virtue of His flesh. If this be not Virtualism, it is all that I mean by the word.

5. Sutton says, "the elements, by the power of divine benediction, do receive a virtue," etc.

6. I come next to Jackson. He uses the illustration of the sun. We talk of sitting in the sun, and of the sun being in a particular room. This must mean either that the sun is bodily in our garden or room, or that only its light and heat are. There is no *tertium quid*. It must mean either the one or the other. To talk of a body being present after the manner of spirits, is pure nonsense. As well say fire after the manner of water. Angels are not omnipresent. They move from place to place. But now let us hear Jackson. At vol. iii., 333, we read: "Thus the sun, though locally distant, for its substance is really present by its heat and light, as well to sore eyes as to clear sight, but really present to both by a contrary real operation. And by the like contrary operation it is really present to clay and to wax. It really hardeneth the one, and really softeneth the other. So doth Christ's body and blood, by its invisible but real influence, mollify the hearts of such as come to the sacrament with due preparation, but harden such as unworthily receive the consecrated elements."

7. Now let us hear Bull. "By or upon the Sacerdotal benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants; and, therefore, they are said to be, and are, the body and blood of Christ, etc.;" all which says Waterland, is true and an ancient doctrine. How then can it be said that Ancient Councils are not even patient of it?

I need not quote Hooker, for every one knows that he was utterly opposed to a local corporeal presence, and to any adoration thereof. So I will only name—

8. Jeremy Taylor, at sect. xi. 22, he says, "How is

it possible that Christ's body should be in heaven, and between it and us are many other bodies interposed; and His body be in none of the intermediates; and that His body should be also here; and yet not joined to that (in heaven) either by continuity or contiguity, and the same body should be a thousand miles off, and ten thousand bodies between them; and yet all this be but one; that is how can it be two, and yet but one? For how shall any reckon two?"

Those who made out our Lord's body to be free from all restraints of place, etc., prove that it is not that body that died, so that it is impossible to prove the fact of His resurrection, whereas it was by sight, touch, etc., that our Lord meant its identity to be established. I cannot refrain from quoting a few words of Hooker. He says (Book v. § 53), "There is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body, but by the true and natural properties of His body, among which properties, definite or local presence is chief."

I am called Heretic. Be it so! I have been so long called that by the Puritan and Romish bodies here, that I am case-hardened. At any rate I think it an honour to share the title with Bull, Jackson, and Cosin. I would rather take my chance with them than with such as Newman, and Dalgairns, who have left us; or with those who still say that they are with us, though they hold Transubstantiation in opposition to the 28th Article, and adoration of a local presence, though directly condemned in the Black Rubric.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITÉ,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON AND THE REV. MERCER DAVIES.

The following letter has, we are told, been addressed to the Dean of St. Paul's:—

"I, MONTGOMERY ROAD, CHISWICK,
"October 28, 1884.

"VERY REVEREND SIR,

"In view of the approaching visitation of the Lord Bishop of London, I beg to call your attention to the protest which I forwarded to you in April last, and another copy of which I now enclose. As his Lordship has taken no steps in the meanwhile to remove the cause of my complaint, I am compelled to lay before you this formal renewal of my notice, contained in the enclosed pamphlet, 'Justice in the Church:' Second Series; * page 5.

"I am sincerely sorry to lay upon you the serious responsibility of dealing with this matter; but I consider this step to be, under present circumstances, absolutely necessary on the grounds of truth and justice. I can, therefore, only leave you to take such a course as you may consider to be required by your imperative duty to the great Head of the Church, who is 'no respecter of persons,' and to whom you will give account for your action herein.

"At the same time, I beg to give you formal notice of my intention to present myself at the Lord's Table, at St. Paul's Cathedral, at the earliest opportunity during the course of the ensuing visitation, and I claim the rights of Christian Communion on this occasion on precisely the same terms which I

have stated in my former correspondence with the Lord Bishop; that is to say, I do not see that I have in any way offended against the Law of God by my former state of concubinage; I do not acknowledge any error therein; and I do not profess any repentance in regard to that particular point (See 'Justice in the Church:' Second Series; pp. 41 and 48).

"As this is clearly a matter of much importance in regard to the spiritual discipline of the Church, I think the result of my present application should be made known to the Church generally.

"I am, very Reverend Sir,
"Your very humble Fellow-Servant,
"MERCER DAVIES.

"The Very Rev.
The Dean of St. Paul's."

Reviews and Notices.

"THE KEY OF DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE, 1884."

By the Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A., Incumbent of St. James's, Marylebone. London: of all book-sellers. Pp. 224. 1s.

THOSE who remember the titles under which Mr. Haweis has published some of his previous volumes of sermons will perhaps not be surprised to find that this rather pretentious title is also the prelude to some more of his pulpit utterances. The book is in fact, as the preface tells us, a collection of short summaries of extempore sermons preached in St. James's Church, in the year 1883, and given forth to the rest of the world as a key to their faith and conduct for the year 1884, and, we suppose, for all future years as well. There is, of course, in the "Key" a wide range of subjects, for it is intended to open many doors. The two first subjects treated being Infidelity and Christianity, in the former he points out how impossible it is to conceive of the world, as it is, having been developed from matter only without slipping in law and life, which is very much the same as slipping in mind. Thus, he intimates, you have in another form the old hat trick "Science puts into its conception of matter all it wants to get out of it by evolution."

Mr. Haweis has a great distaste for dogmatic theology, and makes a clean sweep of all dogma in Christianity in the following fashion: "We owe our dogmatic Christianity not to the Gospels, nor even to St. Paul, but to the subtle workings of the Greek mind in the schools of Alexandria upon the Gospel matter, elaborating in an atmosphere of foreign metaphysics a dogmatic system which was at once swallowed by the Western doctors. (the Roman Church), practical men, with no turn for speculation, and only too glad to get a ready-made working theology, the subtleties of which they were content to accept without understanding; but as nobody has ever understood them, they were not so much to blame—nor are we." The masterpiece of all these metaphysical speculations was doubtless the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; and this is how the doctrine came to be elaborated according to the "Key."

"Jewish, Eastern, Greek, and Roman Christians all called Christ 'Son of God,' each in his own way; but soon the battle was bound to rage round the person of Jesus between the monotheistic-thinking Jew, the one-God believer, and the polytheistic-thinking Gentile, the many Gods believer. To Jewish

* "Justice in the Church." First Series, price Sixpence; Second Series, price Twopence. Sold by Watts and Co., 84, Fleet Street, E.C.

Christians the unity of God was dear ; and to assert God was one, seemed to deny that Christ was God. To Gentile Christians with no monotheistic scruples, the Divinity of Christ was dear, and to assert Christ was God seemed to deny that God was one. Problem : How to state both so as to make them agree or not to seem in contradiction ; how to state the Divinity of Christ without denying the Unity of God. This was a difficulty worthy of the subtlety of Athanasius, and of the Alexandrian philosophy."

Still it seems there was, after all, some truth in the conception which the Alexandrian schoolmen formed of the nature of God, and that the Trinity in Unity "rests on an impregnable basis." We must, however, slightly modify the terms in which we speak of the Persons of the Trinity, if, indeed, we may any longer call them Persons, "God the Vague, God the Definite, God the Immanent," this is the Trinity which is to be believed in both by Christians and those who are not Christians.

There are many now who profess altogether to disbelieve in evil spirits. Not so Mr. Haweis ; but he sees no reason to believe that they have any king. The ordinary and popular conception of Satan as the king-devil he traces up to the Persian Dualism with its representation of Ahriman ever striving against the good Ormuzd ; the Jews having come across this belief during their Babylonian captivity, and developed and handed it on to the Christian Religion. On the other hand we are informed what to do when the devil comes to see us — "The best way to keep the devil out is to be full of good works. You should never have a bill up in the house of your earthly tabernacle. When the devil applies for lodgings there should never be any rooms to let. You can always say, 'The Lord hath need of them.'" *Apropos* of this we have a sermon on "Girls' Work," in which the advisability of all girls being taught some means of earning their living is insisted on, although the author tells us that, in spite of what has of late been advanced to the contrary, he still regards marriage as the key-note of woman's constitution.

The last two sermons in the "Key" are given *in extenso* ; they treat of Spiritualism and Immortality.

With regard to the truth of spiritualism, the "Key" refuses to turn either one way or the other ; its attitude is that "the alleged phenomena of spiritualism, are not true, but are worthy of attention and investigation." And if true, what then ? "If any mind can exist outside the body then *yours* can exist, and you have a new view of the immortality of the soul and the possibilities of your own survival."

And with regard to immortality and the possibility of our existence with bodies formed of unseen or invisible matter, we are called upon to follow the "Key" as it opens to us the following propositions.

1. The absolute distinctness between mind and matter.
2. The intimate connection which we see existing between mind and visible matter (*e.g.*, brains, nerves, &c.).
3. The possible connection which may exist between mind and unseen or invisible matter.

Thus, on the whole, we have a very readable book and one which opens up many useful lines of thought. We cannot say that any of the subjects are dealt with in such a manner as to leave nothing to be desired ; but it is rather the province of a key to open the door than to guide us through the rooms beyond the door, and this perhaps is what Mr. Haweis would have us

understand when he calls his little book a Key to Doctrine and Practice. We regret that a member of the Church of England should treat solemn subjects in the flippant and irreverent manner in which Mr. Haweis too often does, and which we fear exercises a bad influence over young people. We earnestly wish that the author confined himself to writing on secular subjects, such as Music, Holidays, Girls' Work, etc., from which chapters many useful hints may be gathered.



THE Rev. T. L. Papillon, vicar of Writtle, Chelmsford, asks any of our readers "who have had experience in the formation and management of clubs or reading-rooms for young men in country districts if they can communicate to him any of the results of that experience that are likely to be useful, with copies of rules or other printed documents."

ON Thursday the 23rd ult., the Clerical Society of Cambridge assembled in considerable numbers to hear a paper from Mr. Llewelyn Davies on the late Professor Maurice, his teaching on social subjects, and its bearing on the socialistic doctrines of the present day. An interesting conversation followed, in which Dr. Westcott, the Master of Selwyn, and others took part. On the previous night the Church Society, which consists chiefly of undergraduates, was addressed by Father Rivington on "Christianity and Hinduism." The programme of this important society for the remainder of the term is as follows :—October 24th—The terminal celebration of the Holy Communion. November 5th—Statement by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, M.A., Trinity, on "Life in a Theological College ;" paper by A. C. Benson, B.A., King's, on "Modern English Hymnology." November 6th—Terminal service in St. Michael's Church at 9 p.m. ; the sermon will be preached by Canon Whitaker, M.A., St. John's, Chancellor of Truro. November 19th—Statement by F. E. Powell, Christ's, on the "District Visiting Society ;" paper by the Rev. J. R. Harmer, M.A., King's, on "Church Work in the North of England." December 3rd—Paper by F. G. Sandford, B.A., St. John's, on "Fasting." Arrangements have also been made for a series of devotional addresses by the Principal of Ridley Hall, and for special addresses to members of the University on Sunday, November 30th, in Great St. Mary's Church, by Archdeacon Norris, Trinity, and on Sunday, December 7th, by Canon Mason, M.A., Trinity, Rector of All Hallows, Barking.

A PRESBYTERIAN minister, the Rev. John Donaldson, of Kirkconnel, Upper Nithsdale, writes to the *Dumfries Courier* :—"I ran down to Carlisle to attend by invitation the Church Congress. I anticipated much pleasure as well as profit from my two days' visit, and I was not disappointed. I was introduced to the Bishop, who showed me the greatest attention and took me beside him on the platform. What struck me very much was the utter freedom from stuckupishness, if I may so term it, the complete absence of starchiness, and the fine, manly way in which both Bishops and presbyters spoke out their minds to their brother laymen. How charming to think that the great and ancient Church of England, in alliance with the State for more than twelve hundred years, has such noble fellows within her pale, 'workmen who need not to be ashamed,' but who are an honour to their Church and their native land. My heart burned within me when I listened to their words

of plainness and of power, and I never wearied, but was sorry when the Bishop told the last speaker that time was up, and that he must *shut up*. Perhaps, as the Bishop himself said, the most interesting speaker of them all was a working man, by name Powell, from London, who, though he dropped his h's and set Lindley Murray at defiance, being, like the Kaiser Sigismund, '*supra grammaticam*,' yet let fly a volley of broadsides against the mistakes of the clergy in dealing with the working classes, which elicited roars of applause from the audience. We on the platform, Bishops and presbyters, laughed as loud and long as did the mixed multitude below. The workmen's meeting, addressed by the Archbishop and the Bishop of Carlisle, was a most interesting sight. There were three thousand hard-working men of toil listening with rapt attention to the words of Christ's ambassadors addressed to them each one. I shall never forget as long as I live my visit to the Church Congress, and I shall ever feel deeply grateful to the Bishop and all the clergy there for their great courtesy to me, a Presbyterian stranger among them."

"FATHER IGNATIUS," who was conducting Mission services at Llangollen, has written to the Bishop of St. Asaph in the following terms:—"Do you not think that if your Lordship had remembered the circumstances under which our Lord said 'forbid them not' you might have paused before you drove us all out of the church, and forbade me to bring the dear Shepherd's lost sheep to His feet within the walls of the sanctuary? Other Bishops bless and help me. For what cause, in these days of broad-spread unbelief, do you so severely persecute me, who, from my youth, have consecrated my life to Jesus Christ, and who hold fast all the truths of the Christian faith? Will you be so very kind as to be fair enough to tell me for what cause you have passed the most severe public punishment and insult within your power upon me in your diocese? I may then be able to defend myself. Is it right to condemn any one untried and unheard, and without giving an opportunity of defence? In the name of our blessed Lord Jesus I ask you, my Lord, to extend to me the fairness and justice that is granted even to the common murderer—an opportunity of hearing of what I am accused, and of replying to all accusations." The letter is signed "Joseph Leicester Lyne." Bishop Hughes has replied to Father Ignatius regarding his inhibition:—"Dear Sir—I was exceedingly sorry to have to issue you an inhibition, and had hoped that my letter to the vicar of Llangollen would have rendered that unnecessary. Absence from home has prevented my acknowledging your letter sooner. Nothing was further from my wish than to hurt your feelings, but under the circumstances of the case I did not perceive how I could avoid it. Hoping that you may see your way to place yourself in such relation to the Church of England that no Bishop may deem it necessary to forbid your preaching in our churches, I am, dear sir, yours faithfully, J. ST. ASAPH." The Rev. Leicester Lyne, in the course of a long reply, asks—"Could not your Lordship do in regard to me what Archbishop Tait did? permit me to preach in the churches on these conditions—that I wear ordinary surplice or gown, and that I do not plead for monasticism in the pulpit. Other Bishops allow me to officiate without even making this provision." Father Ignatius adds, "Some time ago I received a kind letter from Mr. Gladstone, saying how he wished

I could preach in the churches." Mr. Lyne concluded his eight days' mission on Sunday night, and on Monday lectured to a large audience on "Monasticism." In concluding, he stated he was a monk for five reasons: Because God had called him; because to be a monk was to be most like our Lord; because he was freer to serve God; because he could do more good; and because it was the highest form of Christian life.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Bickersteth, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Framlingham-cum-Saxtead, Suffolk.
 Bode, Rev. George Cowling, M.A., Rector of Saddington, Leicestershire.
 Claridge, Rev. Charles Williams, to the New District of St. Thomas within the Parishes of Holy Trinity and St. Philip, Heigham, Norwich.
 Collett, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Peckham.
 Dodge, Rev. William, B.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Deptford; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Southwark.
 Elsdale, Rev. Daniel Thomas William, M.A., Rector of Moulsoe, Bucks.
 Ford, Rev. Edmund Dence, M.A., Rector of Morningthorpe, Norfolk.
 Hacking, Rev. Egbert, M.A., Rector of Eyam-by-Sheffield.
 Humphris, Rev. Arthur James, Curate of Holbeach; Vicar of Warton.
 Jennings, Rev. James Knight, M.A., Rector of Mundford, Norfolk.
 Johnson, Rev. T. C., Missionary Curate of Rotherhithe; Minister of St. Katherine's, Rotherhithe.
 Jones, Rev. John D., Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool.
 Knottesford-Fortescue, Rev. V., M.A., Curate of Sherborne; Rector of Bubbenthall.
 Nicholls, Rev. F. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen, Canonbury.
 Phillips, Rev. H. Gray, Curate-in-Charge of Weare, Somersetshire.
 Richards, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Tansor, Northamptonshire.
 Smith, Rev. Arthur Hippisley, Rector of Catwick, near Beverley.
 Swindell, Rev. Thomas Greenall, Curate-in-Charge of the Holy Hall District, Dudley; Perpetual Curate of St. Augustine, Holly Hall, Dudley.
 Twells, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Waltham and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.
 West, Rev. R. J., Vicar of Wrawby; Prebendary of Heydom-with-Walton in Lincoln Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Anderson, Rev. Richard, Aiskew House, Bedale, on the 24th ult., aged 92.
 Fitton, Rev. Frederick Chambers, at Laverstoke Rectory, Hants, on the 21st ult., aged 50.
 Gubbins, Rev. Richard Shard, Rector of Upham, Hants, at the Cedars, Herne Hill, S.E., on the 23rd ult., aged 58.
 Guille, Rev. Edward, late Vicar of East Hyde, near Luton, Beds, at Wimbledon, High Park, Ryde, on the 22nd ult., aged 76.
 Hallward, Rev. Nathaniel William, formerly Curate and Rector of Milden, Suffolk, for sixty-two years, and J.P. for the county, at Monks' Eleigh, Suffolk, on the 21st ult., aged 87.
 Hutton, Rev. Francis Pierpoint Burton Norman, M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Leicester, on the 22nd ult., aged 58.
 Thompson, Rev. Cornelius, B.A., late Rector of West Bark with, Lincs., and formerly of Kirtton, Notts, at 2, Codrington Place, Clifton, Bristol, on the 19th ult., in his 82nd year.
 Thurtell, Rev. A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Caius College, Cambridge, at Oxburgh Rectory, Norfolk, on the 21st ult., aged 78.
 Wareing, Rev. James Taylor, of Wellfield, Lathom, Lancashire, sometime of Exeter College, Oxford, on the 20th ult., in his 83rd year.



The Church of England Pulpit.

FORGIVENESS.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. WRIGHT, M.A., RECTOR
OF OLDBURY, BRIDGNORTH.

"Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith He to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine own house. And he arose and departed to his house."—ST. MATTHEW ix. 5-7.

OUR Lord does not ask whether it is easier to forgive sins or to cure disease; but whether it is easier to claim the power of forgiving sins, or to claim the power of curing disease. It is clearly easier to claim the power of forgiving sins. For if a man claimed that he had power to cure diseases, his claim could immediately be put to the test, but if a man claimed the power of forgiving sins, it would be impossible to test his claim. He could give visible proof of his power to cure disease; of his power to forgive sins no such visible proof was possible. But as the power to cure diseases with a word would seem to be as much beyond the reach of man as the far greater power of forgiving sins, Christ's proof that He possessed the less power was evidence that He possessed the greater power which He also claimed.

The narrative is in all respects a very remarkable one. It is remarkable in the first place because it is evident that while our Lord forgave the sick man's sins for his own sake, He healed his disease for the sake of those who stood by. He distinctly gives as His reason for curing the man, "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." It is remarkable also that our Lord claims the power of forgiving sins, not because He is the Son of God, but because He is the Son of Man. It is further remarkable as one of the very rare instances in which a miracle seems to have been performed for the purpose of convincing unbelief. On other occasions our Lord distinctly declined to do this: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas" (St. Matt. xii. 39).

The poor man's friends, seeing the grievous bodily affliction from which he was suffering, brought him to Jesus, that he might be cured of his disease. But Jesus Christ saw into the inmost recesses of the poor man's heart. He saw that he was troubled in his soul, not on account of bodily pains, but that he was suffering from a far

sorer disease, and that if the disease of his soul could be cured, the disease of his body was of little account. The great Physician of the soul immediately ministered to the mind diseased. His very first word was a word of comfort. The man knew that he was a sinner, and doubtless realised that his sin separated him from all good men. With one word the holy, spotless, sinless Saviour bridges over the gulf of separation. He acknowledges a bond that binds Him to the poor sinner, and that bond no artificial one, but the bond of relationship. He calls him "Son." "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." Does it sound strange that the man should be told to be of good cheer—to rejoice, although his body was still rendered powerless by the terrible disease from which he was suffering? Had he, indeed, got all that he needed, although he was still unable to stir hand or foot, and was a bedridden cripple, entirely dependent for all his bodily needs on the kindness of his friends? It may seem strange, but surely it is in accordance with all our experience. For have we not known people who were in such constant pain that their lives seemed one long agony, who were yet contented and happy, and others whose little fingers never ached with pain who were never happy? For, indeed, man is not the slave of circumstance. It is not bodily health, nor worldly prosperity, nor freedom from anxiety that can give happiness, but a mind at peace with God. It has been said—no less truly than beautifully—"Every created thing for the element for which it was created; the fish for the sea, the bird for the air, man's soul for God." And as when the fish is withdrawn from the sea, and the bird from the air, they quickly die, so when the human soul is separated from God, it endures all the agonies of death. We do not know the secret recesses of our own hearts, or the real source of all our trouble. We think that it is this or that outward circumstance that is the cause of our unrest. But the circumstances may change, and yet there comes to us no peace. But we are not left without hope of comfort, for, thank God, "all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do" (Heb. iv. 13). The dear Lord Christ knows our hearts far better than we know them ourselves, and not only does He know our need, but "He is *touched with the feeling*" of it. In Him there is not only perfect knowledge, but perfect love also. "Let us therefore come boldly into the throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need" (Heb. iv. 16). And although we know not what our real need is, this should be no cause of discouragement to us, for He knows. And even though our prayers be feeble and unwise, if they be only sincere, an answer of peace will be given us, for "the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession

for us with groanings that cannot be uttered" (Romans viii. 26).

But what is this forgiveness which was so much more to the poor palsied man than release from his bodily pain, that when he had the forgiveness, it mattered not to him whether his disease was cured or not? The forgiveness of God must be the same thing as human forgiveness, for our Lord teaches us to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." It therefore cannot mean the remission of punishment. When a man on his deathbed forgives his enemies, he does not mean by that forgiveness that he will make no effort to punish them, for whether he forgives them or not, it is quite out of his power to punish them. And when we have inflicted an injury upon a fellow-creature, we ask for his forgiveness, and very often cannot feel happy until we have obtained it, although we may not have the least fear that he will do, or attempt to do us any harm. Forgiveness is reconciliation. When we forgive our enemies we no longer allow the offence they have committed against us to stand between them and us. We regard them as if the offence had never been committed. If they have been our friends before, we receive them back into friendship. Any forgiveness which does not mean as much as this is no real forgiveness at all. When God forgives us, He receives us back into favour, and reconciles us to Himself. And God's forgiveness is free, full, and ungrudging, and ever outruns our repentance. For it was while the prodigal son was "yet a great way off" that his father "saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him" (St. Luke xv. 20). But God in forgiving us does not destroy the consequences of our sin. The punishment remains, but the estrangement is over. The soul is drawn out of the valley of the shadow of death into the Divine atmosphere which is its element. But that the punishment of sin should be remitted would be no blessing to us. The will of God is our sanctification. God purposes to make us good. Holiness is a higher, a better, a nobler gift than mere happiness, and God purposes to give us the highest of all gifts, and to impart to us His own righteousness. And if, when we were forgiven, the punishment were at an end, we should be without that Divine discipline which is needed both to strengthen our souls, and also to prevent their falling back into sin. But though forgiveness does not let us off the punishment of sin, it entirely changes the character of the punishment. What we regarded before as the blow of an angry ruler, becomes the chastisement of a kind Father. The chastisement cannot be pleasant, but we can bear it, not only with patience, but also with thankfulness, for we know that it is for our good, and we know that it is sent to us by One who is not only perfect love, but also infinite wisdom. "No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous,

but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby" (Heb. xii. 11).

Our Lord claims for Himself the power of forgiving sins, not because He is Son of *God*, but because He is Son of *Man*: "That ye may know that the *Son of Man* hath power on earth to forgive sins." Why does our Lord thus describe Himself? We should surely have expected that when He was about to perform so wonderful and so Divine a work as forgiving sins, He would speak of His Divine nature, rather than of His human nature. We are inclined to agree with those scribes who in their hearts were objecting to our Lord's claim, and murmuring, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" We are accustomed to think that the pardon of sin is a power possessed by God alone, and that any man who claims such a power is guilty of impious blasphemy. Not for *men* does Christ claim this awful and mysterious power, but for the Son of Man—that is to say, for Him who is the flower and perfection of the human race. When Christ calls Himself the Son of Man, He is displaying before our eyes a pattern of what we all ought to be, He is telling us of work we all ought to do, of powers we all ought to possess. We are fallen creatures; were we perfect human beings the power of forgiving sins would be ours. The ministry of reconciliation is a ministry committed to man. And that power which man would have if he were perfect is in some degree possessed by earth's purest and best. The forgiveness of sins is the reconciliation of the sinner to God. And we shall find that people of great personal holiness have the power of reconciling sinners to God. Many sinners are hardened in their sin because they regard their own case as hopeless. They think that they are shut off from goodness, and are beyond the reach of God's mercy. They are alienated from God. The hearty human sympathy of one whose heart is full of the love of Christ convinces such a sinner that he is indeed not shut out from goodness, and is thus very truly the means of reconciling him to God. He learns to believe that if a good man cares for him, and is anxious to help him to overcome his sins, the good God cares for him also, and even while he is far off sees him with the eye of pitying love, and has compassion on him. Thus the message of pardon and hope is carried to the despairing sinner by the frail lips of a fellow-sinner. And if this power of carrying the message of reconciliation falls short of the power of forgiving sins, it is not that this stupendous power might not be and ought not to be possessed by man, but because even the best of men falls far short of "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and is not what man was intended to be, or what by the grace of God he shall yet become.

We may now see why in this instance our blessed Lord seems to have accepted the chal-

lence of unbelief. He cured the sick man, not in order to convince the bystanders of His own power, but to show them that they ought to possess similar power. It is as though to the question, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" He had given the answer, "You ought to be able to do so." The class of publicans and sinners—of hardened, hopeless, despairing reprobates—was a class for which not the judgment of God but the hard, narrow, pitiless, selfish life of men, who were in a sense religious, was responsible. It was man, and not God, who had closed the gate of Heaven. It was man, and not God, who had made the way of repentance hard. It was man, and not God, who had made it difficult for the sinner to believe in forgiveness. It was man, and not God, who had hardened the sinner's heart.

Is not this a thought full of terror to us all? "We are members one of another," and we may be responsible for the unrepented sins, hardened hearts, and despairing thoughts of our neighbours to an extent of which we have no idea. In the day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, we may learn with horror that our unloving selfishness has ruined souls. Jesus Christ, who had the right to judge and condemn the sinner, spoke to him rather of the misery than the sinfulness of his life. He stretched out the arms of His love, and called him to Himself in words of tender yearning pity. "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." And the hard heart was softened, the shameless eye was suffused with tears, and the sullen lip quivered with emotion. Love raised and cleansed the stained heart that self-righteous scorn had trodden into the mire. But man, who has no right to judge or condemn his fellow-sinner, denounces his wickedness, and thus plunges him deeper into the gulf of impenitent despair.

Are we guiltless in this matter? Have we never prided ourselves on our righteousness, and regarded an unpitying sternness towards sinners as a mark of that righteousness? Have we not too often been inclined to forget that whatever blessings God has given to us—happiness, peace, knowledge, faith—He has given to us as members of the great human family, not that we should pride ourselves upon them, but that we should use them for the benefit of our less fortunate brothers and sisters? Did not our blessed Lord, when He washed the Apostles' feet as a type and symbol of cleansing from sin, tell them that they should also wash one another's feet? Do we use the peace that God has given us as a means whereby we may impart peace to others? Or are we not inclined to denounce rather than to cleanse the soiled feet of the weary sinner?

But there may be some here this morning whose hearts are full of earnest desire to help the sinful and erring, and for these a word of warning is needed. It is only when we are ourselves near to

God that we can reconcile others to Him. And this nearness to God will make it impossible for us to speak lightly of sin, or to hold the sinner blameless. For if, while we are ourselves far from God, we endeavour to help a sinner by speaking lightly of his sin, we cannot reconcile him to God, but we may reconcile him to sin.

And if there be here any sad, sinful soul, who is weighed down with the burden of his sin, and fears the anger of an offended God, let him take to himself this word of comfort: "Like as a father pitieth his own children, even so is the Lord merciful unto them that fear Him. For He knoweth whereof we are made; He remembereth that we are but dust."

POPULAR LITERATURE WITH REFERENCE
TO INFIDELITY AND PUBLIC MORALITY.

BY THE REV. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., HEAD
MASTER OF DULWICH COLLEGE.

A PAPER READ AT THE CARLISLE CHURCH CON-
GRESS, 1884.

It is my especial wish that the paper which I am to read to the Congress should, in its tone and tendency, be practical. It would be easy, and perhaps agreeable, but I do not think it could be of any definite value, to pass in review some characteristics of the literature which is current among the upper classes of society. I do not doubt it is always, as the poet says, the—

Sublimest danger over which none weeps
When any young wayfaring soul goes forth
Alone, unconscious of the perilous road,
The day sun dazzling in his limpid eyes,
To thrust his own way, he an alien, through
The world of books!

And it may well be that there is a particular cause for anxiety at the present time, not only in the birth of a number of periodical works which have professedly no nobler object than the gratification of a personal curiosity, which is at the best not a high attribute of human nature, and which, in gratifying it, are only too apt to degrade it, but in the mere multiplication and popularity of the ephemeral forms of literature, such as the newspaper, the review, and the magazine, which occupy now so large a portion of life's leisure as to impede and sometimes, I am afraid, wholly prevent the study of the standard works of Christian piety. It has often been to me a surprise and deep regret in talking to boys or undergraduates of cultured homes to find how few were they who had read the "De Imitatione Christi" and the "Paradise Lost," or even the "Pilgrim's Progress" and the *Christian Year*. But after all it is not upon the few but upon the many that the future of the Church as of the State will needs depend. If it be true then—and, alas! it seems to be the truth—that the masses of the people are in some sense alienated from Christianity, or at least from the visible profession of it in public worship, and if one cause of this alienation (I do not say it is the only or chief cause) be intellectual, it will be a task not unworthy of this Church Congress to consider what are the difficulties of belief that the people feel, and how far they are serious and estimable, and in what way the Church may best aspire to over-

come them. For it is surely a strange and sad fact in this nineteenth century since the Lord lived on earth that secularism should not only exist as a force in the world, but should array itself as a Gospel, should speak in tones of joy, of hope, and aspiration, that it should have its missionaries and apostles, its systematic organisation, its popular and daily increasing propagandist literature, that it should be hailed by any one and especially by the poor and suffering as the satisfaction of mental perplexities, the rule of life, the sanction of human morality, the regenerating energy of the world.

Do not let it be thought that I over-estimate the importance of the secularism which I am considering. Probably the truth is that its influence is deep rather than wide, that it has not a large number of professing disciples in any one place, but that it greatly controls the thoughts and lives of those who embrace it. Still, it is clear that the National Secular Society aspires to be to the body of secularists throughout the land much what any Christian Church is or should be to its members. It has its rules and conditions of membership, and seeks to impose certain duties upon its members. It has its articles of belief, one of them being, "That the theological teachings of the world have been, and are, most powerfully destructive of human improvement and happiness." It has its formal rites and ceremonies, such as the naming of infants, which takes the place of Christian baptism, and is the initiation to secularist communion, its matrimonial service, and even a burial service, in which the friends of the departed are told that "man has a heaven, but not that dreamed of by some, far, far away beyond the clouds; but here on earth, created by the fireside, and built up of the love and respect of kindred and friends, and within the reach of the humblest who work for the good of others." And although its temper is prominently destructive, and even necessarily so, as it assails established beliefs, yet it professes to build a positive system of morality upon some such principle as "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." It seems then not unimportant to observe—so much are we in the habit of regarding morality as a definite and invariable quantity—that the morality of secularism, as it may be gathered from its best representatives, is in some material points different from the Christian. Whether it be a higher or a lower morality is a question which need not now be discussed, even if it could be an open question in an assembly of Christian Churchmen; I content myself with remarking that it is different. For I find in one secularist pamphlet the following passage: "What did Jesus teach? Manly self-reliant resistance of wrong, and practice of right? No. The key-stone of His whole teaching may be found in the text, *Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* Is poverty of spirit the chief amongst virtues that Jesus gives it the prime place in His teachings? Is poverty of spirit a virtue at all? Surely not. Manliness of spirit, honesty of spirit, fulness of rightful purpose, these are virtues; but poverty of spirit is a crime." I quote from another secularist pamphlet the following declaration of creed:—"I don't pretend to love my enemies, for I find it hard work to love my friends; and if I have the same feelings towards my enemies as towards my friends I have no humanity in me. I deny that any man is under obligation to love his enemies. I believe in returning good for good, and for evil exact justice, without any admixture of revenge." Nor is this

difference which appears in the theory of morality less apparent in its application to actual life. It would be painful to refer in any detail to certain social doctrines which have been publicly maintained, as the "Fruits of Philosophy," by Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant. But, to cite a single instance which may be mentioned without offence, Mr. Bradlaugh, in his discussion with Dr. Baylee, was asked whether upon atheistic principles man and wife, if their organisation were unsuitable, would be justified in separating at will. He answered—"If they both be of opinion that their continued union would lead to misery, it would be better for them to separate than to live in strife and unhappiness."

It is true that these are only the utterances of individuals, but the individuals are representative secularists. I think it is sufficiently clear from them that, if secularism should ever become the rule of human life, the world would be called upon to consider not only whether there exists an adequate sanction for morality apart from the belief in God and His revelation, but what is the nature of the morality to be sanctioned. It is not so certain, as we are apt to suppose, what are the actions which benefit the majority of mankind, if there be no higher standard of right and wrong than secular happiness. For the fact is, although perhaps the secularists do not see it, that what is now understood to be morality is in a large measure conditioned and determined by Christianity, and that, if the Christian basis of morality is swept away, it will be necessary to build the morality anew from the beginning.

But let me pass now from the morality of secularism to the assaults it makes on Christianity as a system of doctrine. And here I would not use one uncharitable word about any secularist, although his opinions are most abhorrent to my soul. Yet nobody who has not deeply studied secularist literature can realise how false is the view of Christianity held by those who are the bitterest in their opposition to it. Can I give you a sadder instance than the following? There is no more favourite scene in the lectures of Colonel Ingersoll, the well-known American unbeliever, who styles himself a minister of the gospel of Freethought, than an imagination of the Great Day when the thoughts of all hearts shall be revealed, and he says it is the doctrine of all the Christian Churches that if there are two persons, of whom one has lived a virtuous life, and has spent himself and his substance in good deeds, but has been intellectually incapable of orthodox belief, and the other, though he has been guilty all his life through of the worst crimes, yet on his death-bed or at the gallows professes himself a convert, the former will be sentenced to everlasting woe, and the latter admitted to everlasting felicity. But knowing how hard it is to be a believer in any sense worthy of being called belief, and wishing ever to regard religious faith not as a hard duty, but as an infinitely blessed privilege, I do not presume to judge, I would only try to meet and help those who reject the Christianity I love so much. Especially would I deal with them as honest seekers after truth; for only so far as they are such is it worth while to reason with them.

What then are the principal difficulties which the secularists as represented by their spokesmen seem to feel? It appears to me, upon a survey of their literature, that they admit of a summary classification under three heads.

1. I place first the intellectual difficulty of recon-

ciling the early narratives of the Bible, as literally interpreted, with the discoveries of modern natural science, or with the instincts of what is called common sense. Such a work as the *Bible Romances*, of Mr. G. W. Foote, is perhaps, the best, and yet the most crude and painful, instance of the way in which this difficulty may be treated by an atheist.

2. Secondly, there is the alleged recoil of the moral sense from certain historical portions of the Old Testament, notably from the record of the Divine approval said to be granted to such institutions as polygamy and slavery, and to the slaughter wrought by the Israelites in Canaan. It is thought enough to ask whether God approved or permitted such actions as are contrary to civilised morality, and to take the answer, if it is an affirmative one, as *ipso facto* condemnatory of Christianity.

3. But it is chiefly upon one supposed doctrine of the Christian Church—viz., the everlastingness of punishment, or, as it is commonly called, of torture, in the world beyond the grave—that the wrath of infidel literature expends itself. No doubt there is in this literature a grave misconception of the doctrine even as it is held by the most conservative of Christian thinkers; for orthodoxy itself does not presume to say, as it is represented as saying, “that the best man in the world, if he fails to believe in the existence of God or in the divinity of Christ, will be eternally lost.” Still it would be easy to fill pages with quotations showing the horror and indignation which the doctrine of a never-ending punishment, in whatever form it be taught, inspires in minds already alienated from Christianity.

These, then, are the three points of attack. I do not deny that there are others, but these are the chief, and a consideration of them will be a proper means of estimating the characteristics of secularist infidelity.

Now, it is at least a fact which should be stated and borne in mind that upon none of these points has the Church committed herself to a definite and rigid statement of the truth, and that in regard to all of them the widest difference of opinion is not only permissible, but actually existent among her members. She teaches, indeed, and delights in teaching that Holy Scripture contains all such things as are necessary to salvation: but she has never laid it down, nay, she has carefully avoided laying down as an article of the faith that there is a literal exactness in the scientific teachings of the Pentateuch or that the moral enlightenment of the books of Joshua or Kings is the same as that of the Gospels, or that they who in this life accept but partially or do not accept at all the faith of Jesus Christ will be sentenced hereafter to a woe which never ends. I am deeply anxious that my meaning should not be misunderstood. I do not advocate what is called a broad or lax theology. I am for teaching the plan of salvation as a whole, not mere fragments of it. I hold that to give up the Fall of man is to give up the Atonement, and to give up the Atonement is to give up all that is best and most vital in Christianity. But in considering the case of those who are widely estranged from the whole system of the Christian creed and in trying to see if their position is a justifiable one, it is the part not of policy only but of Christian charity to ask what it is that the Church really requires of them and what should be her attitude towards their prejudice and infidelity. May I venture then in due humility to approach the three points upon which, as I have said, they are or think they are at issue with the Church?

1. Take first of all such early Biblical narratives as those of the Creation, the primitive state of man, and the Deluge. It would be unreasonable, as I conceive, on the part of the Church to insist upon a literal and uncompromising acceptance of these narratives. It is not less unreasonable on the part of honest secularists to treat them as the proper subjects of profane scurrility. At the least, and apart from the inspiration of Holy Scripture, they embody not only the historical traditions, but the strongly grounded religious beliefs of many ages, and, if only as such, may claim a reverent consideration. And if it is difficult in the present state of human knowledge to reconcile the early chapters of Genesis with the teaching of certain sciences—*e.g.*, geology—there are other sciences—*e.g.*, comparative philology—which lend a support to them. The fact, which is so loudly proclaimed by secularist writers, that the same or similar traditions regarding the early history of man or of the world are found, though sometimes with instructive variations, in many widely distant parts of the world's surface, is surely as strong an argument for their truth, or for a truth contained in them, as for their groundlessness. There is a strength as well as a peril for the faith in the study of what is called comparative religion; I sometimes think it will prove the corrective or correlative of the materialistic habit of mind produced by natural science. Is there not here then an opportunity, if not of co-operation, yet at least of mutual goodwill and respect among all who are earnestly prosecuting the truth? Let us work on humbly, frankly, constantly, reverently. It may prove—God grant it be so—that not less in science than in morals the very words of Holy Scripture are authoritative. Or it may prove that the Church must modify parts of her teaching and welcome new lights shedding themselves ever and again upon the book of ancient truth. But remembering the admitted imperfection of human knowledge, the law of change, the danger of positiveness, the frequency of discoveries in the realm of science, I am at a loss to see why the intellectual difficulty of accepting a strict or literal view of the book of Genesis should be in itself a reason for setting any honest and earnest soul in utter antagonism to the Cross of Jesus Christ.

2. I come now to the second class of difficulties—viz., such as are found in the morality of the Old Testament. It need not be said that these difficulties have been recognised not less freely by Christians than by infidels, and it is very far from being my wish to make light of them. But what I have at heart to show is that the secularist view of them, or, perhaps, I should rather say the secularist conception of the Christian view of them, is absolutely contrary to the truth. Nothing can be easier, as an argumentative trick, than to assume that, if God Himself is One and ever unchangeable, the revelation of His will must be ever the same; or, in other words, that the morality of the world's infancy must be identical with the morality of its late age. It would be not less easy to impugn the morality of a man by reference to such imperfect moral views as he held in boyhood. What is needed, and what is too often lacking in critical minds, is a sense of historical perspective. For is not the progressiveness of Divine revelation a doctrine perfectly accepted by orthodox Christians? Did not God speak *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* to the fathers? Did not the Lord Himself teach that certain Mosaic regulations were given, not as being absolutely good, but as concessions to the hardness of human hearts?

Nay, did He not on the eve of His departure, tell of the Comforter Who should come after Him, and guide His disciples to the knowledge of all truth? It is consistent then with the truest Christian orthodoxy to allow that there were clouds, sometimes dark and dismal clouds, upon the sky of the Old Testament morality. It is not necessary to justify all the institutions of the Jewish policy, all the outrages of Jewish warfare in the light of the Christian revelation. Christianity is not refuted by quoting a text or chapter written centuries before the Christian era, and demanding if its purport is such as Christians approve. After all morality itself, as human intelligence must conceive it, is in some sense necessarily relative to progress. The highest virtue of one age—*e.g.*, the love of family or patriotism—may come to be an imperfect virtue or an actual defect in another. An institution—*e.g.*, slavery—may have been justifiable once, and yet be justly reprobated by Christians now. The utmost, I think, which can be expected by a thoughtful mind in studying the morality of the pre-Christian dispensation is that such commands as are laid by God upon His people should be the expressions of the highest moral enlightenment of the age in which they are given, or, in other words, that there should be no conflict between the Divine injunction and the moral sense of the person who was called to execute it. Is it not clear, then—and this is all I want to show,—that the secularist is wrong in alienating himself from the Church of Christ and in treating her as an irreconcilable antagonist only because there are passages of the Old Testament which seem to shock the moral sense of the nineteenth century?

3. It remains to consider the doctrine of everlasting punishment relatively to the secularist literature of which I have spoken. It would ill-become me, and indeed I have no wish, to take upon myself the office of teaching the Church what should be thought upon this most awful of all subjects. It is enough for me to try to show that the doctrine which the secularists of the day assail with so much bitterness is an enemy of their own imagining. For whatever be the truth respecting the punishment of human sin in the mysterious world which lies beyond the veil, at least I cannot be wrong in saying that the ceaseless punishment of the vast majority of mankind, and this for simple intellectual error, apart from any consideration of moral conduct, is not and has not been and never can be the creed of the Church. Yet it must be owned that there has been some justification for the secularist view in the rash and random statements of certain Christian teachers. An orthodox believer may well join hands with an agnostic in the condemnation, let me say, of such a work as *The Sight of Hell*, published *permissu superiorum* as a "book for children and young persons," by a Roman Catholic priest, the Rev. J. Furniss. What is the true and absolute doctrine of after-punishment, what should be said of it consistently, so much with individual and isolated texts as with the general scope and tenour of the Christian Scriptures, is another question: and upon it I scarcely venture to say a word. Perhaps a careful study of the Gospels and Epistles teaches one to think that there are, if I may so say, two parallel lines of revelation which can never meet in this world, but will meet, as we humbly trust, in the world to come. But any one who reflects what the everlastingness of future punishment really means, and who feels the moral difficulty of believing it and the need of caution

and consideration in laying it down, may be allowed to plead earnestly that, whatever be our own opinion of it, it should not be rudely flaunted, as a point of the faith, in the eyes of men who are strangers to the entire circle of Christian doctrine, and who will look upon it, not as a part of a great system, but as an isolated tenet of unspeakable horror.

So far it has been my endeavour to consider the difficulties which secularists feel in the system of the Christian revelation. I have tried to show that, when they are reverently expressed, they deserve the charitable consideration rather than the censure of the Church, and that they are not in themselves any adequate justification of the pronounced hostility which the secularist shows to Christianity. But when all this is said, what is the true answer to secularism? Where does it lie? Not, I venture to think, in rancour or the imputation of motives, although what we read is most painful, most unreasonable. Nor again in sensationalism and the profanation of religious phraseology, as in the proceedings of the so-called Salvation Army. One of the most effective atheistical pamphlets I have read is little more than a juxtaposition of certain carefully chosen passages, some of them being the vagaries of Salvationist literature, and others the calm and philosophical utterances of a few enlightened and conscientious agnostics. The vulgarisation of religion, if for a while it attracts a portion of the populace, can only drive to a still greater distance the thoughtful infidels with whom in this paper I have sought to deal. There is one only way of meeting such infidelity. It is to go back to the elements of the faith. It is to present yet once again in its simplicity the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is to leave aside, as far as is possible, all that is legitimately doubtful and disputable in theology, and to point the eyes of men to the Saviour, Who lived on earth and died for all mankind. It is because I feel that the charm of his Divine Personality must work its gracious influence upon the hearts and consciences of men, even of those who are most estranged now from his Church, if only the prejudice which they entertain against Christianity can be done away, that I have sought in this paper to see how far it is possible to meet and satisfy them in the difficulties they express. For, indeed, they do acknowledge the beauty of His character, although too often they turn their backs upon it. "When we consider His purity," says one of the most virulent of living secularists, "His faith in the Father, His forgiving patience, His devoted work among the off-scourings of society, His brotherly love to sinners and outcasts—when our minds dwell on these alone—we all feel the marvellous fascination which has drawn millions to the feet of this 'Son of Man,' and the needle of our faith begins to tremble towards the Christian pole." Yes, and there is more than this; for the radical error of any merely secular system of human life is that it takes no account of the deepest and truest human instincts, the sense of sin, the need of atonement, the desire and capacity for communion with the Divine Spirit, the intuitive apprehension of a life reaching beyond the shadows and limits of this world. This is the Gospel; and it is well worth every effort of the Church to consider the means of winning to it once again those who are now intellectually enemies of the Cross. The difficulty of meeting them is great; none can deny it. I have ventured to suggest that it will be wise and Christian to demand no more of them than the Church in her formularies actually requires. Whether this is

the best method of Christian apologetics I dare not say. But I respectfully submit it to the Congress, adding only, in the spirit of the wisest of the Greeks, that I am willing if so be, to teach others, and as in other matters so especially in this, am not less willing to be taught by others myself.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months' 5s. 6d. twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1884.

THE OVERCROWDED DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

A DISCUSSION of great practical utility took place on the above important subject, at the recent Church Congress at Carlisle. The opening paper was read by Bishop Walsham How, who considered that the Church in her corporate capacity could not be expected to do much in connection with such work; but that individual clergymen, who were brought into contact with overcrowded dwellings in their parishes, had done and were doing much to remedy the evil. He mentioned the name of the Rev. W. Quekett, the first Vicar of Christ Church, St. George's in-the-East, of whom it was said that he knew every drain in his parish. The following clergy were all referred to in the paper as having shared in the same work: Mr. Denton, Canon Girdlestone, Mr. Lowder, Mr. Stone, Mr. Billing, Mr. Barnett, and Mr. Kitto. There can be no doubt that overcrowding in houses is destructive both of HEALTH and MORALITY. We know that the State can and does *intermittently* interfere in such cases, that it employs sanitary inspectors not only to look after pestiferous drains and cesspools, but also to exercise some supervision regarding the number of persons occupying rooms of tenement houses. For as people are not allowed by the State to be poisoned by the effluvia from drains, so they are not allowed to be poisoned by the unwholesome atmosphere of sleeping apartments crowded after the manner of black holes.

The sanitary inspector can and does abate overcrowding *intermittently* under the Nuisances Removal Acts. What is required is that he should do it *continuously*, which can only be practically accomplished either by the employment of an army of inspectors and endless legal proceedings, or by placing houses or parts of houses, let in lodgings, under the regulations prescribed by the thirty-fifth Section of the Sanitary Act, 1866, and the forty-seventh Section of the Sanitary Laws Amendment Act, 1874. We should like to see the Church agitating for the application of these regulations by every sanitary authority throughout the length and breadth of the land. No very difficult task, for the Act of 1874 states that "the Local Government Board may, at its discretion, by notice in the Gazette, declare the enactment contained in the 35th Section of the Sanitary Act, 1866, to be in force in the district of any sanitary authority." Secondly, this overcrowding is destructive of MORALITY, for how can a number of persons of all ages and both sexes occupy the same sleeping apartment, dress and undress in company, and not have all feelings of modesty obliterated in the process? Unfortunate children brought up under such circumstances can hardly ever know what modesty, as connected with the care of their persons, means. It is very easy indeed to see how such overcrowding naturally leads both to intemperance and impurity. To intemperance, because the wretched victims of foul air naturally feel the want of some stimulant to brace them against its depressing effects, and to impurity, because modesty being extinguished by the constant commingling of the sexes in common sleeping apartments, the path is prepared for the total loss of virtue. If rich people would only reflect how carefully they guard their own children at home in such respects, how carefully they are taught in all well-ordered families to acquire habits of the strictest modesty concerning the care of their persons, surely there would be more sympathy for those unfortunates, who are crowded into these dens, and for whom in consequence temperance and purity become almost practically impossible. Bishop How gave some very important practical suggestions on this subject—1st. The Church must create and direct public opinion to it. 2nd. She must enlist workers in the cause to follow such a plan as that of Miss Octavia Hill—viz., to induce some wealthy people to buy blocks of wretched houses and then improve them, and their inhabitants. Lady collectors receive the rents weekly, and try to teach the people better habits. 3rd. The Church should try to rouse the owners of such house property to a higher sense of their responsibility. Some others were offered, but these are the chief. The excellent Prelate truly spoke of such overcrowded houses as "horrible dens" and says he would despair of doing much for the souls of the poor people who inhabit them,

if he had not some allies working on the plan of Miss Octavia Hill to better their miserable surroundings. We hope these striking words will find an echo in many a heart, and that much more will in consequence be done to grapple with this giant evil. Excellent papers were also read at this same meeting by Mr. W. Inglis, of Leeds, and Rev. C. W. Stubbs, Vicar of Stokenham, Devon. Mr. Inglis gave some melancholy statistics from School Board returns. It appears that there are 60,000 families—not individuals—in London, each family living in one room, living, sleeping, eating, bringing forth children and dying in one room! The consequences are “The ruin of young men and women;” “No home training;” “Infant mortality.” “We shudder,” he says, “at Herod’s cruel decree, which robbed Bethlehem of its innocent children, and yet the slaughter of the innocents goes on around us. While in the Mayfair district the infant death-rate was 21·4 per thousand, in the neighbourhood of Southwark it rose to 305·0 per thousand.” Lastly, “A vast amount of physical weakness and deformity.” Out of 6,000 boys examined for the Navy 4,000 were rejected for physical infirmities. Mr. Stubbs’s paper dealt with over-crowding in country districts. It is the same sad story, only on a smaller scale, and with more open air to counteract the evil effects than in cities. Kingsley’s lines are quoted as an accurate description of some cottages:—

Where, packed in one reeking chamber,
Man, maid, mother, and little ones lay,
While the rain pattered in on the rotting bride-bed,
And the walls let in the day.

Mr. Stubbs made some valuable suggestions by way of improved legislative enactments, which we hope may be carried out. As the matter stands it is a crying disgrace to the civilisation and Christianity of England that such “horrible dens” exist within her borders so largely as they do. But they bring their own terrible punishment with them; they are a fruitful source, as has been shown, of infant mortality; they dwarf and cripple the frames of many who are not cut off in childhood; they swell the ranks of the great army of drunkards and prostitutes who infest our streets. Oh, that some great philanthropist may be raised up to make it the business of his life to abate this awful source of bodily and spiritual death, and that every member of the Church in his vocation and ministry may do what in him lies to abate it also, for “Blessed is he that considereth the poor and needy; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble.”

Leave the poor

Some time for self-improvement. Let these not
Be forced to grind the bones out of their arms
For bread, but have some space to think and feel
Like mortal and immortal creatures. God!
Have mercy on them till such time shall come;
Look Thou with pity on all lesser crimes,
Thrust on men almost when devoured by want,
Wretchedness, ignorance, and outcast life.

Have mercy on the rich, too, who pass by
The means they hold at hand to fill their minds
With serviceable knowledge for themselves
And fellows; and support not the good cause
Of the world’s better future. Oh, reward
All such who do, with peace of heart and power
For greater good.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—While it is denied by the able writer who has replied to me in this controversy that the medical language used in the Acts and the third Gospel proves the author to be a physician, it will, I suppose, be conceded that there is quite as much medical language as a physician not writing a medical treatise would be likely to use. “F. T. P.” cannot believe it of St. Luke that “he talks shop out of school,” and therefore, while “F. T. P.” and I may differ as to the degree in which the Lucan writings (or, if “F. T. P.” prefers, those commonly supposed to be Lucan) possess a medical complexion, we may, I think, agree up to this point, that while St. Luke is called a physician by St. Paul, the writings ascribed to Luke bear in their vocabulary at least as much trace of the supposed profession of the writer as could reasonably be expected. With the other very strong links in the evidence, the “*Horæ Paulinæ*” argument for instance, it would be something to say, “Here, in extant medical treatises, there is an opportunity to examine the supposed professional training of the writer of the Acts, etc., and the result, at least, does not disagree with the traditional theory.” That much more can be truly claimed I fully believe; but I may be called on to reply to “F. T. P.’s” contention that the conduct of the writer of the “we sections” was not that of a physician, and firstly, that he could only stare helplessly when St. Paul was attacked by the viper. It appears to me that even if it could be shown that St. Luke (losing presence of mind on the occasion, or perhaps accustomed to town practice) was not ready with a remedy, it would be very far indeed from a disproof that he was by calling a physician; particularly for any readers who, with “F. T. P.,” admit the possibility that the writer of the “we sections” is the same who is called by St. Paul “the beloved physician.” To call this phrase a metaphor is, it seems to me, rather a controversial escape than a probable conjecture. But it must be remembered that the supposed want of resource on the part of St. Luke is an unnecessary assumption; it seems very likely that the barbarians would insist on “Vengeance” getting fair play, and would therefore prevent any help being given (some such remedy as sucking the wound would probably, from practical need, have been known to them had they themselves desired to help), it is quite possible that Luke may have understood from some gesture of Paul that he was not to help; and if these or other such suppositions be pure assumption, I answer that it is also pure assumption that the writer attempted nothing that he does not mention—a particularly hazardous assumption when it is remembered that the writer never once says “I” in his narrative. To reply to the objection that Luke allowed Paul to act in the case of Publius is a work

of supererogation, which, although a Protestant, I perform by remarking that the prohibition of working miracles *de par le roi*, was issued at a later date, and did not apply to Malta. In considering the evidence for St. Luke's use of medical language, I think with "F. T. P." that Dr. Hobart has probably ridden his hobby too hard, I have referred before to his thinking it worth while to note that such a common word as *γῆρας* is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament, and I do not doubt that there are more such cases, but a very substantial *residuum* remains when all fair deductions are made. I do not agree without demur to striking out of the pleadings all medical terms now extant as such only in medical writings later than Luke, for this reason, that a great deal of medical terminology (see Dr. Hobart's quotations) seems to have been common to Hippocrates and these later writers, and it is likely that much more of their terminology than we can now trace was traditional; but suppose all such words struck out, and more will remain than your readers perhaps expect. At an earlier stage of this controversy, from one or two expressions of "F. T. P.'s" (such as, if I recollect aright, his speaking of Luke's using the language of writers of his time, his asking whether I could say that Josephus and Matthew and Mark were not equally medical in their phraseology with St. Luke) I gathered that his theory was that Dr. Hobart mistook what was simply the *κοινὴ διάλεκτος* for specially medical Greek. I therefore took as a specimen the first page of Dr. Hobart's index (it is arranged alphabetically, and I have no reason to suppose the first page to give either a more or less favourable result than any other), and I found that about seventy-four per cent. of the words were used by Hippocrates, *i.e.*, in classical times. All the words, I think, which I have claimed as specially or exclusively medical are used by Hippocrates, with the exception of *θηρίον* in the sense of viper. When it is observed that Josephus uses medical terms in describing the death of Herod, and Thucydides, in describing the plague at Athens, and when this is made a set-off against the use of medical language by St. Luke, it is worth remarking, firstly, that just where Thucydides would naturally use medical language, his vocabulary has nine coincidences (I have not "F. T. P.'s" letter before me, was nine the number?) with the vocabulary of St. Luke; and, secondly, that this is no set-off against Luke's use of medical language in *non-medical passages*, as for instance (one out of many) the very rare word *συγκυρίν* in the parable of the Good Samaritan. I have no thesaurus, and am reduced as before to such information as is supplied by Dr. Hobart and Liddell and Scott, and I find no trace of the use of this word by any non-medical writer except a grammarian who lived about the time of the Norman Conquest, or later. It is always possible to fall back on the possibilities of a vocabulary current, but unknown to us, but (besides that the chances are against this supposition holding often as against coincidences with medical language, when the known Greek literature is so extensive, as, for instance, St. Luke's use of the word *πινακίδιον* for *writing-tablet*, where we are very familiar with the words commonly used to express the thing, of which common words *πινακίδιον* is not one) take the use of *ἀρχαί*, meaning an end, and used in connection with *ᾠδὴν*; *ᾠδὴν* in the singular appears to be at least rare outside medical writers (the word in Hippocrates, however, is *ᾠδόνιον*). This use of *ἀρχαί* (a very common word in other

meanings) is only noted by Liddell and Scott as occurring in the Acts and in one passage of Euripides, and that *ἀρχαί* should appear in this sense of *ends* together with its medical accompaniment of *ᾠδὴν* presents a very marked coincidence indeed. "F.T.P." will perhaps think it gives him some advantage if we consider the argument of Dr. Hobart's (it is only one instance out of several such arguments) which he has specially selected for animadversion, I mean the medical terms supposed to exist in the preface to St. Luke. *Ἐπιχειρεῖν*, I doubt not, is a word common enough, still, when Luke has many other coincidences with Hippocrates, it as at least possible that he had the sentence running in his head, *ὁκόσοι ἐπεχειρήσαν περὶ ἡτρικῆς λέγειν ἢ γράφειν*. *Διήγησις* cannot be claimed as a peculiarly medical word, but surely it was worth while to note, as Dr. Hobart does, that it is repeatedly applied by medical writers to medical treatises, Hippocrates applies the term to a treatise of his own, "Galen uses it of his own treatises and those of other physicians;" "he even uses it of Thucydides' account of the plague at Athens," "and in his Commentary on the Epidemics of Hippocrates alone, he uses it at least seventy-three times of some one or other of the treatises of Hippocrates," and in combination with the above it is surely worth noting how *αὐτόπτης*, *ὑπηρέτης*, and *παρακολουθεῖν* are common in medical writers. *ἐπιχειρεῖν διήγησις*, and *αὐτόπτης* being in the New Testament peculiar to Luke. Such arguments as these must be looked on in their combined force; it is not sufficient to weigh the coincidences one by one, and to say this does not prove the point, nor does this, nor does this, therefore the point is not proved. If you find "sweetness and light" mentioned by a writer you think it likely that mediately or immediately the phrase came to him from Mr. Matthew Arnold. It may be replied that both are common English words, and that another writer (was it Swift?) was the originator of the combination, you meet a few lines lower down with the word *Philistine* in the metaphorical sense, and it may be urged that Mr. Matthew Arnold professedly found the term in German writers. You come before long on "stream of tendency," and still it may be said "what words are commoner?" but by this time I think we shall feel certain that there was a connection *mediate* or *immediate*; a longer list of coincidences might soon convince us that they arose from study at first hand. Thus the argument from the use of medical language by St. Luke is cumulative, you cannot fairly fight the coincidences on the principle of "one down and another come on." I find in the lexicon the singular of *ἀσῖτια* used by Hippocrates, Aristotle, and New Testament (*i.e.*, Luke), I find that *ἀνάψυξις* is used by Hippocrates and (a non-medical writer) Strabo. We learn from "F.T.P." that *ἀχλὺς* is used by Homer as in medical writings, that *ἔκστασις* in the sense of *trance* occurs in the LXX., and *ἐμφορεῖν* in the sense of *bringing forth plentifully* in Josephus; and again when first searching from the lexicon I found that Josephus makes an exception to any claim for exclusive medical usage of *προβάλλειν* for a plant "putting forth" leaves or fruit; *ἐισοχύειν* in the transitive sense is used by the LXX. as well as by St. Luke and medical writers; *πτύσσειν*, *to fold*, can plead the authority of Homer; as, "F.T.P." has very rightly pointed out, *πνοή* is found in prose, *viz.*, in the LXX.; *ἐκψύχειν* finds one lodging place in the LXX., Ezekiel xxi. 7 (*v.* Dr. Hobart). But if any impartial enquirer shall join all these with the terms I

have enumerated in a former letter, I mean the six specially medical terms, *ἀναδίδοναι* (in a special sense), *ἀνωτερικός*, etc., to which the addition of *συγκυρία* seems to make seven, and if he will remember (inasmuch as the LXX. was familiar to the other New Testament writers as well as to St. Luke) that LXX. usage does not completely do away with the argument that may be derived from the occurrence of these words in medical writings, but in the New Testament only in the Lucan writings, or only there in some special sense justified by medical usage—I think such a reader will conclude from this, and from the very abundant evidence given in Dr. Hobart's copious quotations from medical writers, that Luke's vocabulary was strongly tinged by his medical studies—a vocabulary leaning, as might naturally be expected in a writer of Luke's period, and who was not intentionally professional in his language, to the medical terms that were emerging into more general use in later Greek. I despair, Mr. Editor, of conveying in the limits of a letter any fair idea of the force of Dr. Hobart's cumulative argument. To say that a word is much used by medical writers cannot convey the same impression to a reader as seeing a dozen passages or so in which it occurs, and therefore at the risk of seeming to make an ungrateful return for your courtesy, I commend to your readers "F.T.P.'s" excellent example of borrowing your copy of Dr. Hobart's book, or I should be happy to lend my own.

I wrote to the friend who lent me the Celsus and Aurelian (as I had already returned the books) about the references for the use of the word *παρλυτικός*. Unless there are differences of reading, Dr. Major seems to be in error in each instance. Possibly, as my friend suggests, some editor may have put the Latin word *paralyticus* in Greek letters.

ERIGENA.

GOD'S ORDINANCE AND MAN'S DEVICES.

SIR,—At the late Social Science Congress a paper was read by Mr. Thomas Bayley on "A Method of Treating Human Bodies for the Prevention of Putrefactive Changes." It appears that the suggestions contained therein were occasioned by the numerous objections raised against cremation as a sanitary and safe mode of disposing of the dead. What the author of the said paper would have us do savours rather of the Quixotic element. His plan is to expose the bodies, loosely wrapped in cotton wool, on shelves in subterranean galleries to the desiccating influence of cold dried air, and simultaneous removal of aqueous vapour by means of calcium chloride, or other dehydrating substance. Bodies dried in this manner may, Mr. Bayley alleges, be preserved indefinitely. He recommends, however, that after the lapse of time sufficient to ensure the discovery of any suspected crime committed on the body during life, final cremation of the remains should be resorted to.

It is really grievous to reflect upon the peculiar devices recommended from time to time as substitutes for Nature's law and God's ordinance. The peculiarity about the suggested methods is that, in no case, are they calculated to become universal, even provided such experiments were carried out in practice. Frauds upon Nature, and attempts at substituting something or another for the divine mandate, invariably prove failures. Perhaps of the sundry devices of the kind concocted by human ingenuity,

embalming and cremating the dead had most to recommend them. But how rarely in modern times are the dead either embalmed or burned? Not very long since a great outcry was raised in certain quarters for the furnace as the best means of protecting the living from the dangers incidental to ordinary burial. Even a bill was presented to Parliament with the object of reviving a purely heathen rite. The House, however, would not entertain the matter, while the Secretary of State pronounced against a proposition so egregious and so opposed to the national instincts. Some persons in Paris were desirous of imitating the procedure of a few scientists in London. It was thought that the Council of the National Health Society might be induced to accept cremation as an advisable mode of disposing of the local mortality. M. Brouardel, a well-known authority on sanitary subjects, was requested to draw up a report for the edification of the Council. This was done, but its tenor was fatal to the wishes of those in favour of setting up the crematorium. M. Brouardel considered that the burning of the body was opposed to the interests of justice, that crime would rest undetected, and that the wrongly-accused could not be exonerated. Nay, he went even farther, and averred that during epidemics the danger to public health would be increased rather than lessened by the practice of cremation, inasmuch as the different processes require longer personal contact than does simple burial. This is a new and important view, not, I apprehend, previously ventilated. The result was that the Council adopted M. Brouardel's views, and unanimously voted against cremation.

The innovations of our mortuary usages recommended by able and well-intentioned scientists, are mainly the outcome of a corrupt and repugnant system of burial. Did no abuses and menaces to the living exist, none would trouble themselves to devise changes, which after all could be at the best but experimental. The "Republic" of Plato, the "New Atlantis" of Lord Bacon, the "Utopia" of Sir Thomas More, and the "Oceana" of Harrington, would, in all probability, have never been written had the condition of society in their days been perfect. And, in like manner, had we continued the ancient and salutary practice of committing earth to earth, there would exist in our cemeterial system nothing to complain of, or to afford a pretext for a change. As we have departed from the old landmark it is not easy to get on the right course again. Much labour will be required in retracing our steps. Meanwhile let us wish well to the Church of England Funeral Reform Association and no less to the directors of the London Necropolis, who, following Mr. Seymour Haden's recommendation, are doing all in their power to practically carry out sanitary interment, without the intervention of the undertaker or his imperishable coffins. The advocates of earth-to-earth are aware that they cannot effect a marked change in public opinion all at once. Rome was not built in a day. Not only has the public mind to be enlightened but long-standing prejudices have to be removed. The undertakers' influence has also to be counteracted, until they reform their methods. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that before long a marked change will manifest itself, as those in favour of the Woking system of interment are increasing daily. The holding of conferences, the distribution of the "Sanitary Leaflets" issued by the London Necropolis Corporation, and the good services

of the Press, will still further help on the good cause. I was reading the other day the newly published "Croker Papers," and alighted upon a passage which struck me at the time, and may appropriately be introduced here. In a letter to Sir Robert Peel, written in January, 1836, Croker remarks: "Now see the effect of *ventilating* any revolutionary proposal. It sounds preposterous at first, but it is wonderful how soon repeated discussion familiarises the public to the proposal, and takes off the edge of their antipathy to it." I admit that the subject of proper burial is not one calculated to arrest a community under ordinary circumstances. But, when a formidable danger stares a vast population in the face, there is reason to hope that it cannot be resisted. When one contemplates that millions of human bodies lie festering in our London cemeteries, the topic of sanitary burial is likely to be entertained without any repellant feelings. Now that the only apparent feasible substitute for ordinary burial is all but exploded nothing remains but recourse to the earth-to-earth system, at once so beautiful, natural, and innocuous. This is no human device, but has the stamp of divine recognition, "Unto dust shalt thou return."

CLERICUS.

LAYMAN'S WORK IN LONDON.

SIR,—If the parish of Shoreditch can be taken as a fair representative of the rest of "East London," there does not seem much need for the Layman's services being required with regard to "preaching in the Churches." We have about fifty clergymen to twenty churches, which seems quite sufficient for the congregations.

But why should not a bright Children's Service, conducted by Laymen, be held in every school-room in London on Sunday mornings, open not only to the scholars of the Sunday School, but to any child that wishes to enter. "In the morning sow thy seed." Hundreds of children do not attend Sunday School, their parents do not attend Church themselves, and care but little where their children go. At a good Children's Service, such children would learn of "the better way." I have in my mind one lad, who began to love his Church through a Children's Service; his first attendance there was "in rags," now he is one of the best teachers in the Sunday School, and a few years since he presented a new harmonium to the Sunday School, as a "thank-offering." Why should not "mission services" be held in every school-room in London on Sunday evenings. "In the evening withhold not thy hand." At such Services many of the big boys and girls might be induced to attend, who consider themselves "too big for Sunday School." The harvest is truly "great," but I believe the "few" labourers might be converted into many willing "helpers" by proper organisation. We now teach a few children in the Sunday Schools until they get thirteen or fourteen years of age, when nine out of ten are simply allowed to go where they will, without any Service being provided for them.

ALFRED COLE.

November 4th, 1884.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—The chief organ of Romanism is the *Dublin Review*, Burns and Co., London. In the October

number, page 479, there is a notice of a little book, called "Father Placid." The reviewer says:—"The writer of 'Father Placid' appears to have forgotten that it would require a new miracle to keep the blessed Sacrament in an underground hiding-place for centuries—that at the moment when bread, *if it were there*, would suffer change, the presence of Christ would cease in the Host."

This gives cause of much thought. If the substance of bread be once changed into the substance of the Body, why should it require a new miracle for the substance of the Body to remain for a century?

Again he says, still more strangely:—"At the moment when bread, *if it were there*;" aye, *if* it were there, but what if it were *not* there? And how could it be there, when there was nothing there but our Lord's Body? But let us hear him out: "At the moment when bread, *if it were there*, would suffer change, the presence of Christ would cease in the Host." This is all nonsense! There could, according to Rome, be no restoring of the presence of bread, until after the departure of the presence of the Body, whereas this makes the departure of the Body to be caused by the change in the bread, which was not there at all at the time. Indeed, the writer feels this difficulty, for he says of the bread, "*if it were there!*"

I wish they would tell us plainly what they mean. When the substance of the Body takes the place of the substance of the bread, what becomes of the substance of the bread; is it removed elsewhere? If so, where? Does it return from that place when it is to resume its accidents of taste, etc.? If they say that bread does not remove, but is turned into the Body, is the Body afterwards turned back again into bread? Our Lord's Body, Soul, and Divinity, as they say, turned into bread. Who can believe this?

One of the great Verts, Dalgairns, maintains that the three persons of the Trinity are present in the Host ("The Holy Communion," Duffy, Dublin, p. 91). And that "our Lord can see us from the Host with His bodily eyes, and hear us with His outward ears," page 102. "Eye, hand, and ear are as distinct as ever," page 103. He acknowledges that the Church has not actually defined all this blasphemous rubbish. But he says it has high authorities in its favour. It is time for us to utter our condemnation of it and all its champions. If Rome will disavow it, let her do so.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

THE GALILEE CHAPEL AND BEDE'S TOMB.

SIR,—Can any of your readers inform me why a certain chapel belonging to Durham Cathedral is called the "Galilee" chapel? It was stated in a recent paper in the PULPIT that Bede's remains are buried there, with the inscription on the tomb—

Hæc sunt in Fossâ Bedæ Venerabilis ossa.

I am not questioning this, having seen the tomb and inscription myself; but it is stated in the preface to Bede's Ecclesiastical History, by Rev. L. Gidley, that Bede was buried at Jarrow, and the following epitaph was inscribed on his tomb there:—

Presbyter hîc Bedæ requiescit carne sepultus :
Dona Christe animam in Coelis gaudere per ævum.
Da illi Sophiæ debriari fonte cui jam
Suspiravit ovans intento semper amore.

Mr. Gidley, strange to say, makes no reference to Bede's tomb in the Galilee Chapel at Durham. Can any of your readers explain this matter? Were the mortal remains of Bede first buried at Jarrow and afterwards removed to Durham?

HISTORICUS.

THE Bishop of Oxford has contributed £10 to the Church Army.

THE Bishop of Bedford has become a vice-president of the Bethnal-green Free Library.

THE Bishop of London is holding his visitation at St. Paul's. His lordship will deliver his Charge on Friday.

THE Rev. Ralph Doyle, British Chaplain at Genoa, advertises that he is sadly in want of a boat for the Genoa Harbour Church Mission.

THE Bishop of Riverina (Dr. S. Linton), New South Wales, is about to sail for his new diocese, and urgently appeals for £700 to complete a fund necessary to take out with him.

THE Dean of Westminster proposes to give on Saturday afternoons a course of ten lectures at the Abbey on the Book of Ecclesiastes, in continuation of those on the Book of Job. Beginning on Saturday next it will be continued till December the 20th, and will be resumed on the 3rd of May.

ON Sunday evening St. Michael's Church, Cambridge, was crowded to the door by undergraduates who had come to hear an address from Canon Scott Holland on "Social Purity." There has certainly been a most hearty response here to the efforts of those who are endeavouring to call attention to the terrible responsibility of men of the upper classes in this matter.

The Central African Mission had a good, if somewhat scantily attended, meeting at Cambridge on Saturday. The Rev. C. Maples gave an admirable and most inspiring address; last Sunday was a regular field-day too, for the committee had been able to arrange for special sermons in several of the town churches; during the present week important meetings will be held in several of the colleges.

WE learn from the *Maidstone Journal* that the Archbishop of Canterbury has been making through his diocese a tour, in the course of which he visited about thirty country churches. Leaving Addington on Monday week he visited Chislehurst, St. Paul's Cray, St. Mary Cray, and Horton Kirby, where he stayed the night. On Tuesday he went to Horton Kirby, Sutton, Eynsford, Farningham, Stansted, Trotterscliffe, and Wrotham, where he stayed the night. On Wednesday the churches of Wrotham, Addington, Offham, West and East Malling, and Watlingbury were visited, his Grace arriving at East Farleigh late in the afternoon, where he was the guest of the vicar, Canon Elwyn. The next morning he preached at a special service. He next drove to Loose, visiting also during the day the churches of Hunton, Linton, and Hadlow, and being entertained at night at Oxonhoath. On Friday he was at Plaxtol, Ightham, Shipborne, and Kemsing; and on Saturday he took Chelsfield and Farnborough, on his way back to Addington. During his tour he inspected parish registers, visited schools, and had pointed out to him anything of special

interest, besides having introduced to him a multitude of church-workers.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Audland, Rev. John Heslop, M.A., Rector of Tubury, Berks.
 Babington, Rev. B. B., Chaplain at Caen, Normandy.
 Baily, Rev. Johnson, M.A., Vicar of South Shields, Rural Dean of Jarrow.
 Baynes, Rev. James Pilkington, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Princes Park, Liverpool.
 Chapman, Rev. H. Le G. D., Vicar of St. Osyth, Colchester; Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Canning Town.
 Cole, Rev. John, Vicar of Isle Brewers, Somerset.
 Cosgrave, Rev. William Frederick, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Barnabas, Hendon, Sutherland.
 Davies, Rev. Philip, Vicar of Pontbleiddyn, near Mold; Vicar of Llanfairtalhaiarn, Denbighshire.
 Evans, Rev. Evan, Curate of Pentraeth; Vicar of Bettwsycoed.
 Francis, Rev. D. H., Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Canning Town; Vicar of Great Bentley, Colchester.
 Gill, Rev. Ebenezer Ernest, M.A., Vicar of Mullyon.
 Hayman, Rev. Henry Talford, B.A., Vicar of Edwinstowe.
 James, Rev. Henry Lionel, Curate of St. Clement's, Ipswich; Chaplain of Christ Church, Laxey, Isle of Man.
 Jenkinson, Rev. D. W., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Luke, Tittensor.
 Jones, Rev. David Lloyd, Curate of Portmadoc; Perpetual Curate of Ynyscynhaiarn.
 Jones, Rev. John Lloyd, M.A., Curate of Holyhead, Anglesea; Rector of Criccieth-cum-Treflys, Carnarvonshire.
 Jones, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Curate of Ruabon; Vicar of Mold, Flintshire.
 Kemp, Rev. Edwin Richard, Chaplain of St. Anne's, Lincoln.
 Lund, Rev. T. W. M., Rector of St. John's, Cheetham; Incumbent of St. Mary's, Hardman Street, Liverpool, and Chaplain to the School for the Blind.
 Maber, Rev. J. S., Curate of Barcombe, near Lewes, Sussex.
 Majendie, Rev. Henry William, M.A., late Vicar of Holy Trinity, Barnstaple; Perpetual Curate of Tormohun.
 Moriarty, Rev. James H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Swiftsure*.
 Poland, Rev. William Henry, Vicar of Linkinhorne.
 Paget, Rev. Cecil George, M.A., Vicar of St. James', Holt, Dorset; Surrogate.
 Sparling, Rev. D. H., B.A., Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Oldham; Rector of Christ Church, Biddulph Moor, Congleton.
 Tapper, Rev. Isaac William, Vicar of Fisherton Delamere.
 Thistelton, Rev. A. C., M.A., Chaplain of Upper Berwick.
 Winbolt, Rev. Henry Holt, B.A., Vicar of Sutton St. Edmund.
 Winsor, Rev. Charles J., Chaplain of High Legh, Knutsford, Cheshire; Vicar of Market Drayton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hey, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of South Petherton, Somerset, and formerly Precentor in Bristol Cathedral, on the 13th ult., aged 48.
 Hughes, Rev. Evan Owen, M.A., Oxon, at Llanddeniolen Rectory, Carnarvon, on the 29th ult., aged 78.
 Iselin, Rev. John Frederick, M.A., late of C.C.C., Cambridge, Assistant Director for Science, Science and Art Department, at Rosenfeld, Streatham, on the 1st inst., aged 52.
 Owen, Rev. James Richard, M.A., late Rector of Llanferres, Denbighshire, suddenly, at Rhyl, on the 20th ult., aged 72.
 Roberts, Rev. Horace, D.D., suddenly at the residence of Lieut.-Colonel Jay, Tollesbury, Essex, on the 29th ult., aged 74.
 Sharpe, Rev. Clement Charles, seventeen years Vicar of Bucknell-cum-Buckton, Salop, on the 27th ult., aged 57.
 Smith, Rev. Fred. Jeremiah, Vicar of St. John's, Taunton, and Prebend of Wells, at Mary Street House, Taunton, on the 30th ult., aged 75.
 Wilder, Rev. John McMahon, B.D., Rector for thirty-six years, at Brandestone, near Norwich, on the 31st ult., aged 72.



The Church of England Pulpit.

IS SELF-PRESERVATION THE LAW OF NATURE?

BY THE REV. FREDERICK C. WILLIAMSON,
B.A., CURATE OF ST. GABRIEL'S, PIMLICO.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. GABRIEL'S, PIMLICO,
ON SUNDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1884.

"None of us liveth to himself."—ROMANS xiv. 7.

THE shocking story of the sea is fresh within the recollection of us all. We have shuddered at the horrible details which the newspapers have told us. God forbid we should judge the actors in that ghastly drama. Most people will be inclined to think that no punishment any tribunal can inflict will be as unendurable as that which they have brought upon themselves. The curse of Cain will cling to them. They have woven for themselves a Nessus-like shirt which they will never be able to put off.

It may be all very well for us, who sit at home at ease, to criticise their conduct, but we may perhaps be allowed with the poet of old to ask, Is it worth while,

Propter vitam, vivendi perdere causas.

Is it worth while, for the sake of preserving the bare animal life, to lose all that makes life worth living, all that sweetens it? Would we could forget this ghastly story! I only allude to it that I may protest against a principle that some, at least, who have spoken and written about this miserable business, have insisted on. "Self-preservation is the law of Nature," they tell us. I deny it. It is not. There is another law. We shall, I think, if we look a little deeper, see that not selfishness but self-sacrifice—compulsory, indeed, with but few exceptions—is the law of Nature. Is there no law of mutual help? "True it is," as the wise man says, "that the very hyssop on the wall grows there because all the forces in the universe could not prevent its growing there, but did not all the powers of the universe combine to make it grow, if only it had worth and valour wherewith to grow? Did not the rains feed it, the very mortar in the wall give lime to its roots? Is it not true that all things live for each other? That self-sacrifice, not selfishness, is at the bottom the law of Nature, as well as the law of Grace? Is it not true that everything has to help something else to live, whether it knows it or not? That not a plant or an animal can turn again to its dust without

Vol. XVIII.—No. 464.

giving food and existence to other plants, other animals?"

Self-preservation is *not* the law of Nature, it is a law. Even the brute beasts that have no understanding tell us that it is not the law. You all know how timid, fearful beasts and birds seem at times completely to change their nature; how in defence of its young, for instance, the naturally timid animal becomes bold and fearless. The lower principle of self-preservation is driven out, expelled by the nobler principle of love, not for self, but for others. Self-preservation is by no means the highest law, holding good only till some higher, nobler law comes in and sweeps it away.

Years ago, when serving as a subaltern in the Crimea, "Chinese" Gordon, while going his rounds one morning, noticed some little disturbance in one of our batteries. He inquired the cause of it, and was informed that some sand-bags had been knocked away by the heavy Russian fire to which they were exposed. A sergeant had ordered one of the men to go up and repair the damage, but the man was inclined to consider that self-preservation was the law of nature. Without an instant's hesitation Gordon clambered up outside the battery, and standing there exposed to the storm of shot and shell, ordered up the two men to come and stand beside him and do the necessary work. It was done, and the three men descended safe and sound. But I need not multiply instances to show that the law of self-preservation only holds good until a higher law—as here the law of duty—comes in. When the strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace, until a stronger than he shall fall upon him and overcome him. So the law of self-preservation is only able to hold its own until the coming of a stronger, a more masterful one.

Look at the great cross of St. Paul's gleaming brightly in the summer sun, proudly defiant of the wintry storm, towering calmly above the smoke and din and clamour of this mighty city. Look at it! Is it not an everlasting protest—he that runs may read—against the principle that self-preservation is the highest law?

There are some who seem to think that it is the law not only of this world, but also of the world to come; that all they have to think of, work for, pray for, is to save their own souls, to get to heaven. We must be on our guard against religious selfishness. Do you ever think of those deep words of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, deep words, that mind us of the poet's saying,

Yet all experience is an arch, where thro'
Gleams that untravelled world, whose margin fades
For ever and for ever as we move.

So these deep words of our Lord's ever open out new vistas of meaning: "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it." Was our Lord

ever thinking of saving His own life? Was not St. Paul willing to pray that he might perish if only he might save others?

Is not this the only idea that many enemies of the Christian faith have, that persons are religious only because they hope to reap some material reward, if not in this world, at least in another? Not worldliness, as the cynic bitterly remarked, *but other-worldliness.*

I do not know that you will find our Lord, either by what He said or did, ever gave us cause to think that self-preservation was to be the law of His kingdom, that a Christian's leading thought should be to save his own soul. The more a man is filled with the love of God the less does he think of self. "Self is a poor centre," says Bacon, "it is mere earth." "Empty by filling" is a saying full of the deepest truth. The only way to empty a man's heart of the love of self is to fill it with a higher, a nobler, a more disinterested love, the love of God, and of His Son. The teaching of the Prayer Book gives little encouragement to this principle of religious selfishness. We are taught to pray not merely that we may get to Heaven, but that here in this present world we "may lead a godly, righteous, and sober life," that we "may daily proceed in all virtue and godliness of living," that we may "live godly, righteously, and soberly in this present world."

I have tried to show that self-preservation was not *the* law, only a law of Nature, and not the highest. You may have noticed a shallow pool in among the rocks at low water. The water stands still and weltering in the blazing sun, but the tide is rising—rising—nearer and ever nearer the advancing waves roll in, narrower and narrower grows the intervening space; at last, with a rush that cannot be denied, the tide bursts in, sweeping out with its cleansing waters the half-stagnant pool, filling it with fresh life and vigour, joining it once more to the boundless ocean life.

Like that small pool is the heart of some man, full of thoughts of self-preservation; at last the tide of some great opportunity draws nigh, and with a rush that cannot, will not be denied, a new, a higher law bursts in, the law of duty, of self-sacrifice. Into the soul of such a man, like the insweeping rush of the resistless tide, is borne the truth that the selfish view which he has hitherto had both of life and religion is not the only one, not the highest view; he begins to ask, not so much what he can get for himself, but what he can do for God and his Church; the thought that self-preservation is the highest law of his spiritual life is swept away, and in its place there stands another—the service of God. "To be walking with God, however humbly, to take part in that service which suns and stars, which angels and archangels, which strong and patient and holy men and women have in all times done; to be in some small corner of the field,

stout and brave, and at last triumphant in our fight with lust and cruelty and falsehood, with want, or woe, or ignorance, with any of the enemies of God." Is not this a higher, a more ennobling thought?

Unless above himself he can
Exalt himself, how mean a thing is man.

NATURE'S PENALTIES FOR DISOBEDIENCE.

BY THE REV. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., CURATE
OF PENWORTHAM.

SERMON PREACHED AT NEW LONGTON CHAPEL,
IN THE PARISH OF PENWORTHAM, ON SUNDAY,
OCTOBER 19TH, 1884.

"And when David and his company came to Nachon's threshing-floor, Uzzah put forth his hand to the ark of God, and took hold of it; for the oxen shook it. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him there for his error; and there he died by the ark of God."—2 SAMUEL VI. 6, 7.

IN the Epistle to the Galatians, you will, I hope, remember that St. Paul likens the law of Moses to a schoolmaster, or (as it would more correctly be translated) to a guardian, set over a child whom he is to educate until he reaches manhood. The law of Moses, that is, was intended to teach the Jew, and to prepare him for the Gospel, and it taught him to a great extent by means of sacrifices and rites, which answered very much the same purpose as "object lessons" do now.

But this design of teaching and preparing the Jew was not the only purpose either of the law, or of its sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies. Many of these had a meaning, permanent and enduring for all time, so that we as well as they may still learn many lessons from them.

Just such an "object lesson" was the Ark of God; its form and still more its contents suggested and still suggest many lessons.

In form the Ark of God was a hollow chest, about four feet long and nearly three feet high, having over it, as a covering, a plate of pure gold overshadowed by two cherubim with their faces bent down and their wings meeting. On that covering, called therefore the mercy seat, the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled, never on the ark itself, the sole purpose of which seems to have been to contain the two stone tables of the law. And by God's express command only the priests might ever touch the Ark, and when the camp of Israel moved from place to place they only might bear it on their shoulders.

What does all this suggest to us? Three things principally—by the tables of the ten commandments being kept within the Ark we are taught that upon this earth, of which the Ark was the figure, God rules by law and order. Secondly, by

the blood of the sacrifices being sprinkled on the mercy seat, the figure of Heaven, which covered the Ark, and never on the Ark itself, we are taught that while law rules on earth, mercy yet reigns in Heaven, and that when the act of willing self-sacrifice is offered on earth, God accepts it, and then mercy is shown in Heaven. And thirdly, by the command that none touch the Ark save only the priests, we learn that none but he whose life is spent in the service of God can ever offer to Him acceptable worship.

And first, the tables of the commandments within the Ark signify the reign of Law here on earth. But this reign of Law must be looked at on two sides. On one side we see that the reign of Law is the cause of boundless blessings; a moment's reflection will fully show us this. For how would it be possible ever to make any plan or arrangement for the future, or exercise the smallest care or forethought of any kind, unless we knew that according to their regular and orderly system the seasons would obey their yearly course. How, for instance, could the farmer sow his fields, except in reliance on God's promise that while the earth lasts, spring-time and harvest, summer and winter, should not fail? Or how could the sailor navigate his ship, if sometimes the compass pointed to the north and sometimes did not? In all the works of nature, order and regularity are the one thing absolutely necessary to enable us to make them of any use to ourselves, and it is in the constancy and regularity of God's laws of nature that we find the highest and truest proof of His goodness and loving kindness.

Thus every earthly blessing may, in this sense, be said to come to us according to Nature's laws, laws whose seat is in the bosom of God, whose voice is the harmony of the world, to which all things in heaven and earth do homage, the very least as feeling their care, and the greatest as in no way beyond their power and control. But to all this there is another side. Constant and invariable are the laws by which the world and all that therein is, is guided and governed. But because of this very constancy and unchangeableness, he who breaks them must suffer the consequences. This is the lesson which we learnt from the fact, that the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled on the mercy seat, never on the ark itself. For laws are no respecters of persons; it is useless appealing to them for mercy, the good man who breaks them, even in ignorance, must suffer the penalty equally with the bad. We see this especially in the working of those laws which affect our bodies. What is it that causes health? Speaking generally, the difference between a life of health and a life of sickness, is exactly the difference between a life lived in obedience to God's invariable laws, which rule the growth and preservation of our bodies, and a life in which

those laws are disobeyed. For, if a child be born with a good constitution, then if its parents obey the laws of health, both as regards it and also themselves, the child will grow up healthy.

And yet, in spite of the absolute invariableness of God's laws, and the absolute certainty of their mode of working, how many there are who, like Uzzah in our text, profane the ark of God by wilful disobedience to His laws; and, therefore, like him, have to suffer the certain consequences. Death seems a severe penalty for simply touching the ark, but we see just the same penalty inflicted for what seem very small offences against the laws of health almost every day of our lives. Thus for instance there are two great and important laws relating to our bodily health, disobedience to which inevitably brings its proper penalty—one the law that if we would be healthy we must be clean, clean both in body and in dwelling;—the other the law that the air we breathe must be pure and fresh. And remember that we can all of us obey these laws if we like—it is not money or the want of money that makes the difference between a healthy and an unhealthy home. There are plenty of houses where the husband earns nothing more than ordinary weekly wages, and yet the cottage and its furniture are clean,—the windows are regularly and properly opened, and the air is sweet and pure, and why? Because while the husband is doing his work *outside*, the wife is also doing her duty *inside*, but unfortunately, there are some houses where this is not so, and then, God's laws being broken, as surely as the penalty came on Uzzah, so surely does it come on that household. Often it comes in the form of bad health, fever sometimes, or more often that constant languidness and feebleness which makes work a weariness and even life itself a burden.

And in the train of a dirty house, where nothing is ever washed or made tidy, and where neither door nor window is ever opened, often there comes another evil. Such a house (for it cannot be called a home) drives the husband to the public-house in the evening, and even worse, sometimes for the relief of what is solely and simply her own fault, the wife is driven there in the day time, and many households know too well what that may lead to. I do not mean that the husband is therefore excused, should he become a drunkard, and, of course, the wife is not, but I do say that often part of the blame of a drunken husband must lie on the shoulders of the wife. And even when these evils do not come, even when a good constitution throws off the ill effects of unhealthy habits, and a good conscience forbids a resort to evil ways; yet, is it fitting, is it right, is it seemly that any should wilfully live in defiance of the plain and clear laws of God? To do that,—to live in wilful disobedience to God's laws of health,

and yet to come to God's house professing ourselves there His servants, while yet in our daily life we disobey Him; what is that but a most unreal and inconsistent worship? Is it not doing exactly what Uzzah did, namely, to take on ourselves a privilege we have no right to perform? For we have said that the command was that none might touch the ark save the priests, God's professed servants only; and we have explained that the permanent meaning for us of that lesson is, that none but the true servant of God can ever offer to Him an acceptable service. The true servant of God is he, who, not content with merely saying Lord, Lord, also does the will of the heavenly Father, not only ruling his life according to law, but also worshipping according to law.

For there are laws of worship, the first of which is given us by our Saviour Himself. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. And the second law of worship, if not exactly given us by our Saviour, at any rate comes to us bearing the stamp of His approval. It is the law of a consistent worship, not a worship of the lips only while the heart is far off, but a worship in which heart and voice unite "to make one music."

Is it so with us? If not, would it not be well to think of the lesson taught us by the fate of Uzzah? He, though not a priest—not, that is, a servant consecrated for ministration to Jehovah,—yet wilfully and profanely took on himself the work of a priest. His penalty was death. How can we know that the same penalty will not overtake us if we sin in the likeness of the same sin? To come into God's house without reverence for the owner of the house; to come joining (or professing to join) with our lips in the confession of sin, while yet we feel no sorrow for sin; to come with the prayer for forgiveness on our lips, while yet we desire none in our hearts; to sing the psalms on the beauty of holiness, and hymns about the joys of heaven, when holiness is distasteful to us, and heaven a home where in heart and mind we never go; what is that but a profanation, and what other penalty can it bring than the penalty of spiritual death? For a cold, heartless, and indifferent service,—what is it like but an unhealthy diseased life, a life without either energy or enthusiasm, a life which is really only a living death? What then shall we do? Two things; first we must amend our lives, and learn to obey that command of St. Paul's, "I beseech you, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service." And secondly we must remember the lesson contained in the fact that while no blood might be sprinkled on the ark, the figure of this world where law and order reign, yet on the mercy seat, the figure of heaven, where God in mercy is enthroned, the blood of the sacrifice was to be offered. And that sacrifice we must offer

according as Christ has commanded. For just as if we would have bodily health we must obey God's laws in the natural world, so if we would have health of soul, we must also obey God's laws in the spiritual world—the laws, namely, that worship must be in spirit and in truth, and that worship and life must be in harmony and agreement the one with the other. Not he who only sings the praises of Christ, but he who also does the will of Christ; not he who only uses words of prayer, but he who prays with the spirit and the understanding; not he whose voice only pours forth words of gratitude, but he whose life proves that his heart is thankful, he alone offers a reasonable service. To offer this reasonable service is both the privilege and the duty of each one of us, for we are commanded to come boldly to the throne of grace. And a heart that rejoices to do the will of God, and a worship that truly honours His holy name, they together make life one continual service, one long hymn of praise to Him, who giveth bountifully and upbraideth none, and whose mercies are over all His works.

THE stewards of the Worcester Musical Festival have a balance in hand, after payment of all expenses, amounting to £439 17s.

THE Bishop of St. Alban's has been "dedicating" a new cemetery for the town, instead of "consecrating" it. If we understand the report rightly as it appears in the newspapers, the significance of the change of form consists in the omission of any legal deed of consecration, a fact that will call to mind a saying of the late Bishop Thirlwall, that, in his opinion, the essence of consecration consisted in the signing of a deed, which could be done in the sitting-room as well as in a church.

THE Bishop of Durham, presiding at the Missions to Seamen meeting in Sunderland lately, exhorted shipowners to do their religious duty towards their crews. There were 38,000 British merchant ships, and not one of them had a chaplain on board. Again, the Admiralty provided a library for each vessel of the Royal Navy, comprising, on an average, 600 volumes. Could not the owners of merchant vessels do something in that direction? It was of extreme importance, that the captains should be encouraged to hold services, and that at all events no hindrance should be put in their way. He heard the other day of a captain who had actually resigned his command because the vessel had been chartered to others and he was forbidden to do that which he had been accustomed to—to recognise the Lord's Day by a service. Companies, it was said, had no consciences, but the members of companies would have to give an account to God, and he besought them, so far as it lay in them, to do all they could that the blood of the sailor might not lie on their head, and they be required to give an account of it hereafter. The Bishop of Gibraltar has placed £100 a year at the disposal of the Missions, for the support of a Scripture-reader for the 62,000 British seamen who annually visit Bilbao; and a gentleman who has had eighteen months' experience at Cardiff has been selected for the post.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1884.

BISHOP FRASER'S CHARGE.

WE have always paid great attention to the utterances of the Bishop of Manchester. He is no vulgar prelate, content with decorating a cathedral and conducting a ceremonial, with keeping a diocese or a congress in good humour by an adroit exhibition of personal *bonhomie* and jocularly, with presenting deft arrangements of words as substitutes for facts. The episcopal bench has plenty of occupants of that inferior quality, but Bishop Fraser has always seemed to us to aspire, and partly to attain, to higher things. He observes the signs of the times, and, in many respects, rightly interprets them, and he might, perhaps, become a leader of thought and action, if only he would set some bounds to his life of ceaseless movement, and give himself time to think all his subjects through, and weigh each word before he utters it. He has been guilty, in past time, of some random sayings, but his charge just issued did not contain any such. It opened with a just appreciation of the critical character of the present time. He said:—

"Great questions, affecting not only the relations of the Church to the State, but touching the Church's own standards of doctrine, ritual, and discipline, are in agitation everywhere. We are living in the ferment of a new time. The old order changeth. . . . I am sure that now is a time when we have all need to rub our eyes and try to ascertain the tendency of things; and if there be indeed a stream outside ourselves which makes for righteousness, and the old channels, which once sufficed, are too narrow to contain it, we must see whether those channels cannot be widened, lest the stream become a flood and break down all barriers, and the very ideas of order and rule perish in the outburst of an anarchical fanaticism. That there is some danger of this no reasonable man capable of observing phenomena, and of calculating their drift and force, can doubt."

He then invited his brethren in the ministry—

"Calmly to consider with him what these phenomena precisely mean; what these stirrings and yearnings indicate; what modifications in our system and methods may help us to guide and perhaps to satisfy them; and generally to learn whatever lessons of wisdom or expediency they have to teach us."

This exordium leads to exaggerated expectations which we must confess were not realised. In the following parts of the charge the Bishop had something to say on "the modifications in our system and methods" that may be required, in order to guide and perhaps—ah! perhaps—to satisfy the stirrings and yearnings of the age. But, on the deeper questions, which infinitely transcend those of doctrine, ritual, and discipline, which occupy most episcopal minds—the questions about God and man, about the mysteries of life and death, about the past and hereafter, which are employing the more serious class of minds, and respecting which men demand facts and will no longer be satisfied with *formule*—on these the bishop had nothing to say. He left the subject with the questions stated, but not answered; and he did not return to it. Is he not like us all? He is conscious of ferment, agitation, change. He sees that affairs are in their crisis, and that a new time is coming. But, like the rest of us, he does not see how deep the change may go. Nor has he yet sufficiently studied those vague stirrings and yearnings and aspirations, which he shares as well as we, but which he can no more interpret than ourselves.

Was wir wünschen, was wir wännen,
Ach! wir wissen's nicht einmal.

At this point, the prophetic mantle fell from his shoulders; and he descended into the world of common life. Into the detail of diocesan matters we do not propose to follow him. But there were some points relating to the Church of England at large, on which the views of so able and honest a man deserve the closest attention. He dealt with the subject of the diaconate. He thinks that, under the present law, laymen cannot preach in churches, nor assist in the distribution of the Sacrament; but that ordained deacons, although engaged in secular pursuits, may do both. He therefore proposes to ordain such, on the conditions laid down by the two Convocations, the chief of which are that the candidates must be thirty years of age, and must serve gratuitously; and also, he considers that the statute law requires that they must not be actually engaged in trade. We are afraid that the enforcement of these conditions will dry up all the sources of supply. Those who would aspire to these offices would be men under thirty, for whom the enthusiasm of youth has not passed away. If doctors and lawyers are accepted, on what principle can merchants or shopkeepers be refused? Nor is the class of idlers which would be the only remaining recruiting ground if trades and professions

were excluded, be likely to furnish zealous labourers on the spiritual field. On the question of the Ecclesiastical Courts, his chief recommendation is to give immediate legal force to the personal decisions of the Bishop, the abuse of this great power on the Bishop's part being carefully guarded by a right of appeal. This view he adopts from the Archbishop of York and Lord Penzance; and we are of opinion that if the right of appeal be made capable of exercise by a short, easy, and inexpensive process; and, if the ultimate decision of every question be retained in the lay court; such an arrangement might work very well. On the question of Church Patronage, he has not yet made his way to the one fundamental idea, which will and must be embraced at last, that all admixture of money considerations with the bestowal of spiritual office is a moral crime, which must, at whatever sacrifice of position or endowments, be abolished, root and branch. With regard to Church Boards, he adopts unreservedly the principle, and most of the provisions contained in the Bill of Mr. Albert Grey. He looks on that measure as a necessary concession to the democratic principle, "the onward march of which," he says, "must be evident to us all," and he repeats, once more, and again with approbation, Archbishop Benson's clap-trap about "trusting the people;" still ignorant, apparently, that the real doubt is not so much of the moral desire of the democracy to govern rightly, as of their intellectual capacity to see the right course and to select the fittest men. In his remarks on Ritual there was nothing that he had not often said before. After that, he perorated, having dealt only with the outward framework of things, having indicated certain extensions and improvements of the channels through which the spiritual influence is to flow, but having given no reply to any of those deeper questions which relate to the nature of that spiritual influence itself, and which he himself had stated in his first words. It is the popular demand upon the bishops for ceaseless physical activity, and the eagerness of the bishops themselves to satisfy that demand, which directs the attention of all our best ecclesiastics to things external. No one now expects any valuable literary effort from the episcopal bench; they are every day of their lives engaged in rattling about their dioceses, and have no time for such employments. We cut all our blocks with razors. We take a man like Lightfoot, away from the higher function of demonstrating truth, and set him to conduct ecclesiastical ceremonies. We call a born antiquarian like Stubbs from the midst of his musty records, and set him to confirm young children. Meanwhile, those who desire guidance on the great questions of the day cease to look for it to the chief officials of the Church. They look to the professors in the universities, but most of all to the philosophers.

A time comes to the man of pleasure like Horace, as to the man of faith like Paul, when he feels constrained to put away childish things. When that time comes he applies, as in Horace's days neither to pontiff nor to *haruspex*, but to the philosophers. The latter think out their subjects and accept the logical conclusions. But such is not the case with our *flamines*. Bishops must save time for deeper study, if they would retain any hold on the progress of the human mind.

ON HERESY.

HERESY (*αἵρεσις*) is derived from *αἰρέω*, which originally signifies to take or to seize; and secondly, to choose; being in this meaning generally, though not always, applied to choice or adoption of opinion. The derivative adheres with the not unusual Greek exactness to the meaning of the verb. When it came to be an ordinary expression in theological literature, *αἵρεσις* was almost altogether confined to the conventional sense, choice or adoption, not of things in general, but of opinion. In this sense St. Paul uses it in the very few instances that it is found in his writings, associating it, however, not with the operations of the mind in its investigations into things, but classifying it with active spiritual sins and evils, wrath, strife, etc. Being so classified, and yet being from its nature as much an intellectual act and exercise of mental power, as a spiritual act and exercise of the responsible will, it has frequently appeared to independent thinkers that there is a difference between this sin (if sin at all) and those other manifestations of evil selfish human nature with which it is classified. In examining into this, and into the general nature of what heresy is, there is no great difficulty offered in apprehending what meaning St. Paul attaches to the word. It is plain from his contexts that he does not attach any moral delinquency to merely the taking up or adopting of an opinion; for this, no matter what circumstances may accompany the taking of it up, and the setting of it forward, cannot be the characteristic guilt of a thing which is similar in its nature to all those disturbances in the body politic, the body ecclesiastic, and even the family, which we call as things we dislike, wraths, strifes, or in modern talk by the contemptuous word quarrels. We must fall back on the derivation of the word to reach its complete meaning; which is the evil exercise of choice. Choice is an act of the will, and the evil exercise of it—every act of the will or determination being a moral act—the application of the will to things towards which the will ought not to act, but submit itself, is accordingly heresy. Heresy is the illegitimate and sinful exercise of the power of choice in the matter of forming judgments.

How this exercise may be, and often is, applied, is best to be understood from familiar examples. It is not uncommon to hear such expressions as "I will not believe" this or that, or, "I am resolved to think" so and so. Whoever seriously employs such speech, meaning what he says, abandons the power of forming judgments; he subordinates, or more than subordinates, his mental faculties to his will, perhaps to his passions. Suppose one who deliberately says he will not believe that the angles at the base of an isosceles

triangle are equal to one another, or that the earth moves round the sun, we set him down as a fool or a lunatic. But this is really no worse than the case of one who, in forming any conclusion or judgment on anything which is fit for the forming of a judgment upon, abandons his reasoning powers, and subjects them to an antecedent choice. All intellectual prejudice is thus either heresy or of the nature of heresy; for the will in those things which are the proper domain of reason ought to be submitted to the reason, not the reason to the will. Although the absurdity of judging of mathematical truths, if such can be called judging, not according to reason, but according to antecedent choice, is so manifest that no warning against it, at least in the existing state of human intelligence, need be required; and although the mischief of such choice is much more needful to be had in regard, in respect of such things as are not capable of mathematical demonstration, but only of probable proof, yet the two absurdities are alike, and are even the same; they differ only in the extent to which they are pushed. A man may have a very strong preconceived opinion upon a subject, let us suppose concerning the absolute truth of the earlier Roman history, and after having searched into the matter, and having found that Niebuhr's strictures upon that history carry weight, be it more or less, he may finish the matter, as far as his own opinion is concerned, by saying, "All this may be true, and appears convincing, but nevertheless I am determined to continue to entertain my ancient opinion." Such a man is an heretic. A contemporary of Newton, who after studying the *Principia* may have said, "This is unanswerable, but I will not accept it," was an heretic likewise. But he was a more harmless lunatic than the other, for his delusion was less specious, and less likely to be infectious and liable to command sympathy. Coleridge says concerning those who give a determination of will as grounds for a particular belief in matters of Biblical criticism or classical antiquities, that their mental attitude is like that of a man who judges of the merits of a picture or a statue as a work of art by its smell. He deprecates such judgments, and such expression of their grounds, as common in his time. It is certainly the case that such expression of will as ground of judgment is far less common now; but it is not certain that such judgments are really less common.

Men sometimes say that they have a right to believe what they choose; and they call this the right of private judgment. It requires little analysis to make it plain that the man who chooses first and "judges" afterwards does not judge at all; and to speak of right in connection with the abandonment of the faculty to exercise which a right exists, is to inflict a serious if not (in the case) fatal wound on the sacredness of the right. The right of private judgment is very certainly a right, but it cannot exist without a power to use it and a faculty to apply it; and like most other rights, it is possessed in company with a parallel duty, and ceases to be a right and becomes a wrong, unless the duty be discharged when it is exercised. A judge has by law the right to decide causes, but it is his duty, before delivering his verdict, to examine the evidence and the precedents. St. Paul says, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." But he who chooses first and judges afterwards holds fast all things, and then tries to prove what is good, being very likely to fail in his proof by the damage he cannot but inflict

on his intellectual powers by their subordination to his almost certainly vicious choice.

What is evil and of the nature of moral transgression in this is the disposition; the consequences of such process of forming judgments being also mischievous, both in the effects on the action and on the mind of the person so employing, or misemploying, his mental powers. One effect is generally in experience amongst the most common, that is, upon the temper of the person. One who has arrived at hasty, prejudiced, selfishly adopted opinions—for all exaltation of the mere will is selfishness—is far more likely to be pragmatical and quarrelsome in advancing and maintaining them than one who has come to sober and reasoned out conclusions. Therefore St. Paul is justified in classing the act, which is the product and the cause also, of evil temper, with those manifestations of evil temper that are unmistakable by all—wraths, strifes and emulations. Like them, it exists in degrees; also, like all other transgressions. It is not generally a useful exercise of thought or ingenuity to apportion or measure the degree of guiltiness which belongs to each stage of a particular vice. The loud-voiced fanatic who preaches some new doctrine of his own, or some perversion of the truth which he thinks he has discovered to be the real truth, may be less far removed from Divine grace than the self-satisfied indolent conservative, who says to himself that all that he has been taught is the best of all possible opinion. There may be, as Coleridge says, a seditious spirit in a court, and there may be an heretical spirit in the chapter of a cathedral. The most powerfully drawn picture in our literature of this variety of aspiring sin is Tennyson's heretic soul, who built himself a lordly treasure-house; who doubtlessly thought himself one of the most intellectually free of all the souls and spirits in the world, and yet who was the slave of an enslaved will, till he humbled himself, "struck through with pangs of hell." It is seldom, no doubt, that the self-willed spirit of heresy breaks into open blasphemy; but it has, without exception, its root in pride and foolishness.

From this it appears that the evil of this spiritual sin resides, not in the thing thought, but in the manner of thinking it; and accordingly that the acceptance of an heresy, a particular form of originally mis-concocted opinion, crystallised into a false dogma, is secondary, and is in reality describing the thing formed by the term that properly belongs to the process of forming it; calling the fruit by the same name as the root. Properly, therefore, not only heresy is by no means identical with error, but also any particular heresy is not so merely because it is identical, or identifiable, with the particular error that belongs to it. To err, more or less, belongs to all men, inevitably, because no man, in body, spirit, or mind, or intellect, is perfect. But to be heretical, that is to set up one's own will, which ought to be the captive, as the judge, while a disposition of which all are capable, is no more a disposition to which all are prone, than to be fornicators, drunkards, or haters of one's brethren.

To err in judgment is not to be an heretic. Imagine as strong a case as we can think of. Suppose one of those Corinthians amongst whom contentions (*ἐριδες*) prevailed, but a professed follower neither of Paul, the founder of his church; nor of Apollos, its favourite orator; nor of Cephas, the supposed orthodox judaizer; nor of Christ, except as a painful, yet

distant imitator of his humility and perfectness. Suppose such a man coming to St. Paul and telling him, with reluctance, and almost fear, that he could not accept his doctrine of the resurrection of all men, because that Christ's human body had never seen corruption, and could not therefore be a model or an ensample. And suppose St. Paul, asking this Corinthian, Whom have you told concerning this opinion, this error, I assure you, which may shipwreck both your soul and body? and which certainly deprives you of a most precious hope? and that the man answered, No one; we have divisions enough, and it is not for me to make more, but I cannot help thinking that which I say. Again, suppose another Corinthian churchman, who hearing the epistle read which terminates with showing that tremendous mystery to the Church of Corinth, and to the Catholic Church of all ages, getting up and saying, This man preaches new and absurd things; I call on you of Apollos, and on you of Cephas, and on you of Christ, not to acknowledge this fanatic dreamer, founder though he was of our congregation. Would Paul have put these two men in the same category? Would bigotry itself classify them together? Surely not. The one is a diligent searcher after the truth, and he will certainly, according to our Saviour's promise, find if not all, yet some of it; the other thinks he has got possession of it all, and displays his paste diamonds as if they were regalia, careless of the emulations and contentions that he excites. He that found treasure hid in a field, and for joy thereof went and sold all that he had, and bought it, was very possibly running the risk of finding the hidden jewels not real; but the merchant who dealt in pearls knew by experience to judge of his merchandise, and was not, like the first, in danger of error.

If it be taught that the right of private judgment is the parent of heresies, because that judgments will and must differ, and that some must be erroneous; this is identifying error with heresy. Whereas error is not of necessity heretical; it may be entirely free, or as entirely free as human imperfection is susceptible of, from heresy; while it is very possible that truth, or that true opinions, may be heretically held. Error may be opposite to truth; it is not necessarily its antagonist. No man possesses the whole truth about everything; all men are possessed, though not all dominated, by some error. This is no more than saying that men are imperfect. The essential antagonist of Truth is not Error, but Falsehood.

This subject is practical as well as theoretical; although, from its nature, there are very few practical maxims which can be adduced concerning it. The love of Truth and of Right, of Justice and of Beauty, will guide to the framing of rules by which they are best to be sought. The laws of logic and of language, like those of mathematics, are exact; it is not rules such as they are, or rules so much as those ultimate ideas that lie beyond them, that we must have regard to in our contemplation of these things and their essences. Those ideas are ultimate and fundamental, and are not subject to reason; reason is rather, if it can be subject at all, subject to them. It is not of them that prejudice can justly be predicated; they are matters of essential prejudice, to use that word as it is sometimes, perhaps rather loosely, applied; while merely intellectual prejudice is always of the nature of error, and when deliberate, of the nature of heresy. Generally, a man may regard himself as freest from

the dominion of heretical disposition when he accords the most intelligent, while the least slavish, deference to authority; discerning those things in which authority is lawful from those in which it is an usurpation. Its slave is the conservative heretic; he chooses the comfortable flesh-pots before the spiritual freedom, with its privations, of the desert. The rebel against authority is the revolutionary heretic; he despises indolence, the indolence of inaction; but shuns the hard labour of study, and what is sometimes the hardest labour of all, of thinking. He loves the external and corporeal freedom to be found in action, and supposes that it is real freedom; while he is a captive, bound with the chains he has forged for himself, strong in proportion to the strength of his unsubdued will.

Finally, heresy is the exercise of the will in choice, illegitimately and selfishly, and therefore sinfully; and the first heresy was when the parents of mankind chose to follow the advice of the serpent, and not the warning of the Creator.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE GALILEE CHAPEL AT DURHAM AND BEDE'S TOMB.

SIR,—In reply to "Historicus" allow me to say that the name "Galilee" refers to "Galilee of the Gentiles." It was regarded as less sacred than the rest of the cathedral, being furthest from St. Cuthbert's shrine. Hence women were allowed to enter it. There is a Galilee Porch at Ely and also at Lincoln. I believe they are of the 13th century. The Galilee at Durham is of the 12th, being the work of Hugh de Puiset, whose long episcopate lasted from 1153 to 1195.

There is no reason for doubting that the greater portion of Bede's remains are buried there. But relics of Bede were highly valued, and fragments of the body were no doubt scattered all over Europe. Nevertheless, considerable portions were found when the tomb was opened May 27th, 1831, viz., Much of the skull, portions of the shoulders, parts of both arms, the thigh bones, parts of both feet, &c. These were carefully replaced.

That Bede was originally buried at Jarrow, there is no doubt. But in the 11th century a priest of Durham stole his bones. The following is the account of the transaction given by Simeon of Durham in his "History of the Church of Durham," cap. xlii. This priest had been in the habit of paying an annual visit to Jarrow. "Upon a certain occasion he went thither as usual, and after spending some days there in the church in solitude, praying and watching, very early in the morning he returned alone to Durham (a thing which he had never done before), his companions being ignorant of his departure, for he seemed like one who did not choose to have any witness of his secret. Although he survived this event many years, he did not trouble himself ever again to visit the said monastery of Jarrow, but behaved like a person who had secured the object of his desires. Being frequently asked by his intimate friends where was the resting-place of the bones of the venerable Bede, his usual answer (given

with the readiness of one who knew what he was talking about) was to this effect: 'No one knows better about this than I do. Dearly beloved, consider this as a thing most firmly and certainly established, that the same shrine which contains the most holy body of the Father Cuthbert, contains also the bones of the teacher and monk Bede. Let no one seek for any portion of his relics outside the covering of this shrine.' Having thus spoken, he enjoined his friends to keep the matter quiet, lest the strangers who were resident in that church should plot some treachery."

In an old English poem of about the 11th century the city of Durham is described, and among other facts this is stated:—

"Therein along with them is
Ethelwald the Bishop
And the illustrious author Bede."

Some say that the bones of Bede were removed from the shrine of St. Cuthbert soon after the completion of the Galilee Chapel. More probably they received a separate shrine about that time, but were not removed from the protection of St. Cuthbert to the Galilee until late in the 14th century. For farther information I may refer your readers to Raine's "Durham Cathedral," Ormsby's "Sketches of Durham," Murray's "Guide to the County of Durham," and Greenwell's "Durham Cathedral."

A. PLUMMER.

University College, Nov. 9th, 1884.

OVERCROWDED DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

SIR,—In your admirable article on "The Overcrowded Dwellings of the Poor," you say, "Secondly, this overcrowding is destructive of morality, for how can a number of persons of all ages and both sexes occupy the same sleeping apartment, dress and undress in company and not have all feelings of modesty obliterated in the process?" And then you go on to say, amongst the remedies: "1st. The Church must create and direct public opinion to it." But how? How is public opinion to be properly created and directed? Tell us what we can do, for in one respect the case in country villages like Penwortham is even worse than in large towns, since there there are obvious difficulties from which we are free. Our cottages are not "rookeries," we have not—at least we in Penwortham have not—bad landlords, our aristocracy is both resident, charitable, and popular, many of the cottages are rented low, and the villagers are earning the usual wages, often supplemented by factory work. But these wages will not and cannot pay for more than the ordinary-sized village cottage, seldom containing more than two bed-rooms. It is no use, therefore, crying out against the landlords, for larger cottages would be too expensive for the labourers to live in, even if they were rented so low as to pay less than bank interest on the capital spent, and therefore just the very evils I have quoted from your article exist here, even under our favourable circumstances, just as much as in the London "rookeries." Therefore, I ask what are we to do to form that enlightened public opinion of which you speak? I venture to make two practical suggestions. The real cause of the evil is the enormous family which the British workman not only needlessly calls

into being, but also thinks himself a fine fellow for so doing. And worse still, the Church almost tells him he is a *religious* man for so doing. Thus, in the marriage service, we say that marriage was "ordained *first* for the procreation of children," thus putting, with all the coarseness of a Restoration period drama, that first which should be put last. Later on we pray that the couple may be "fruitful," in spite of the fact that the country is over-populated already, and worse still, when the mother comes to be churched, we read her a psalm written at a period (the return from the captivity) when every child was as valuable to the returning exiles as they still are to colonists, and therefore very naturally saying, "Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them." But in the present day such a statement is a deliberate untruth. To the wage-earning classes, and indeed to all the lower middle classes, a "quiver full" simply means an incessant struggle to keep the wolf from the door—it means the abandonment of every higher taste than food and rest, since no such can possibly be paid for; and as children grow older it means exactly those evils your article points out. Yet we clergy still go on in a false conservatism, saying one thing when we are "on duty," and another thing when we are "off duty," and some make, or at least used to make, that worse which was bad enough before, by teaching that "God never sends mouths without also sending food to fill them," a doctrine I have heard proved by the "fact" that plenty of hips and haws on the hedges are a sign that we shall have a severe winter; God sends them so that the poor birds may not starve!

Therefore (1) let those two services be amended, and, still more, let us clear our minds of cant, and not hesitate, the clergy to their adult male classes, and their wives to their young women's classes, to speak *quite plainly*. It cannot be done in the pulpit, but it can be done in class, and it ought to be.

And (2) let Bishops and influential laymen show, and show if possible emphatically, that they recognise that pastoral care is the first essential of clerical usefulness, and that they rate merely showy gifts at their proper value. Let them show that they think it disgraceful while these evils are in our midst and cry aloud for reformation, that any should waste either time or energy on one side over "Conferences" to prove the Pôpe Antichrist or something equally important; or on the other side over that equally important matter, "Wherewithal shall we be clothed?"

GEO. BLADON.

Penwortham, 8th November, 1884.

[We would remind our correspondent that, if this country is over-populated, which is by no means proved by the state of the dwellings of the poor, none of our enormous colonies are; and that we think it would be far better to advocate and organise emigration, as Mr. Styleman Herring does, than to thwart and amul the beneficent processes of Nature, as Mr. Bradlaugh and other pseudo-scientific Radicals advise us to do.—ED.]

SIR,—Allow me to call attention to two of the causes of the "overcrowding of the poor." 1. The large increase of the rates, chargeable upon the dwellings of the poor. In Shoreditch, in 1874, the total of the rates collected was about £110,000 while in 1884 the amount was £140,777 9s. 3d. The Police Rate, County rate and the Guardians' ex-

penses, in supporting the poor, remain about the same now as in 1874; but not so the School Board and Board of Works precepts, as the following figures show:—

	1874.	1884.
School Board Precept	£1,358 6 11	£19,525 13 2
Metropolitan Board of Works Precept...	4,804 17 7	16,056 16 11
Total ...	£6,163 4 6	£35,582 10 1

The increase of £30,000 in ten years is nearly all due to these two Boards, and the poorest of the poor, who live outside the workhouse, have to pay their share of this ever-increasing expenditure. I would suggest that relief is urgently called for, either in the shape of reduced assessments, or in the exemption of these poor dwellings from paying taxes at all.

2. The increase of rent to the dwellings of the poor. Houses in Hoxton, with four rooms and a washhouse, that ten or fifteen years ago were let at 8s. per week, now are let at 14s. per week. I need not point out that the result is, people have to put up with one room instead of two. And this is not all: a few years back, nearly every one of these houses possessed a small garden, now this is the exception; in most cases the "property has been improved" by the landlord building workshops or stables on the gardens to within a few feet of the back of the houses, thus further crowding up these poor people. I would suggest to Christian landlords, to carry out their religion by "doing unto others as they would have others do unto them."

ALFRED COLE.

November 11th, 1884.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—Don't you think that in mercy to your correspondents and readers it is high time the discussion on this subject should cease. Life is too short to read, much less to write such epistles. I sigh for relief.

AN EXHAUSTED RECEIVER.

[Inasmuch as ours is an historical religion, we think most of our readers will tolerate this toilsome research on account of the vast importance of its subject, even although their patience may be somewhat exhausted. If it be important to fix the date of the *Διδαχῆ*, it is surely not less so to determine the dates of our Gospels.—ED.]

Reviews and Notices.

"THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE, &C."

By the Rev. William Kirk Hobart, LL.D., ex-scholar of Trinity College, Dublin. Dublin: University Press Series. 1882. Pp. 305.

THIS is the work of a scholar for scholars. It is beginning to attract some notice at the present time, from being quoted in the "Present Day Tracts" series and elsewhere. We have no doubt that, in the future introductions and commentaries on the New Testament, it will take a place philologically beside such specialists as the Danish Munthe, and the Germans, Bretschneider and Lösner, who have illustrated the New Testament respectively by quotations from Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, and Philo. The author deserves credit for industry of research in the voluminous medical treatises which he has consulted, and

for presenting his matter clearly and carefully to his readers, while the good letterpress and paper are equally creditable to the Dublin University Press. The only fault is that the index is printed in an unnecessarily small type. Why should any part of such a book of reference be made a trial to weak eyes? With this minor exception we welcome the work of Dr. Hobart as a useful addition to our helps for students in examining the Greek of St. Luke's Gospel and Book of Acts.

Passing on to the object for which the work is written, viz., to prove the identity of authorship of the third Gospel and of the Book of Acts, and also that the writer was a medical man, we fail to see that Dr. Hobart has added much to our previous conviction of identity, or that he has made good his second allegation. Passing by the first point as of minor interest and considering only the medical question in reference to an individual of whose time and place of birth, education and training, time and place of composition of the Gospel and Acts attributed to him, we know absolutely nothing, we think that Dr. Hobart could not have proceeded too cautiously, nor have surveyed the field of probabilities too widely, before coming to a definite conclusion. But this is what, in his enthusiasm for his studies, he has not done. He is somewhat like a geologist, who should discourse so long and so exclusively on "the new red sandstone," as to ignore the existence of all other *strata*. Dr. Hobart's references are confined to four medical writers—the works of the Alexandrian Serapion being unfortunately lost—and of those four one only, Hippocrates, a physician of the fourth century B.C., preceded St. Luke. And when we say Hippocrates we include, in the sixty writings and more attributed to him, a few that are genuine, and a large number which proceeded from his disciples. Further, not only does St. Luke nowhere mention Hippocrates, but his peculiar views concerning the four fluids or humours of the body, as primary seats of disease, and his "critical days" and changes of the human body, analogous to those of the seasons of the year, &c., nowhere appear in the third Gospel or Acts. Dr. Hobart, therefore, in default of any other kind of evidence, is driven to examine the phraseology of Hippocrates and his later *confrères*, and where similar words appear to those in the third Gospel and Acts, he diligently notes it, and claims that these words are part of St. Luke's medical phraseology. The argument is uncritical. On the same ground we will undertake to prove that Bunyan was no tinker, but a poet, from his using identical words with Milton, and that the author of Hudibras was a physician, from the identity of many of his words and idioms with Robert Boyle's "Natural Philosophy." Dr. Hobart constantly forgets that there inevitably is in the ordinary every-day language of educated people, whether that language be Greek or English, a number of current terms and idioms which are common property, and which non-professional people use as well as professional men; indeed the argument is much stronger in the case of the Greek medical language where there was nothing purely technical, nor of foreign derivation. Persian words and Latin words and phrases Grecised appear in the New Testament, but none of them are claimed by Dr. Hobart as proving his case.

But if there is no certainty that St. Luke had read the medical works of Hippocrates, there are certain books which it is quite certain that St. Luke had read and was familiar with, we mean the LXX. This was

the Bible of Hellenistic Jews and of Greeks. Now, with one solitary exception, St. Luke has twenty-two quotations in the third Gospel and twenty-one in the Acts, more or less closely following the LXX. Here there are over forty witnesses that St. Luke was well acquainted with his LXX. Nor must we forget that the LXX. included a certain number of Greek additions to the Hebrew text which are mis-styled apocryphal in our English version. Starting from this surer premiss, we have been at pains to examine every one of the 415 words and expressions enumerated by Dr. Hobart as having medical analogues, and we find that nearly ninety per cent. of them existed already in those books of the LXX., with which we have the best reason to believe that St. Luke was already familiar. Several out of this ninety per cent. occur frequently. If, in addition, we strike out of Dr. Hobart's index those words and phrases which occur in the earlier and later classical writers, particularly in Arrian, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, and Polybius, as the common property of Greek literature, the *residuum* will be of a very diminutive character. Of these few, putting aside compounds of common verbs, and St. Luke appears to have compounded verbs freely, we have left, *συκομορία*, the name of a tree, "the fig-mulberry," and three words which have a more decided medical look, viz., *τρήμα*, "a perforation," *ὕδρωπικός*, "a dropsical man," and *πυρετοί*, the plural of the common *πυρετός*, "fever," possibly "intermittent fever." To these we are inclined to add the word *ἔσση* in connection with *ῥύσις αἵματος* (Luke viii. 44). These words appear to us to emerge out of the crucible of strict criticism. All but *πυρετοί*, which is found in Acts xxviii. 8, and which St. Luke may have heard from the physician attending "the father of Publius" as part of his complaint, are found in the third Gospel.

As St. Luke does not claim to be an eye-witness of Gospel events, but an accurate recorder of those who had that privilege, it appears to us necessary to show that he was acquainted with Aramaic, the common language of our Saviour in Galilee, and that he translated himself the original Aramaic into his own Greek, or else he was at the mercy of some one or more previous translators, whose less polished, and shall we say less medical Greek, he remodelled. To ourselves we must confess it sounds strange that Dr. Hobart should adduce instances of medical expressions from the parables and teaching of our Lord, as though St. Luke had put that colouring into them which did not exist originally. The danger of this kind of argument is manifest. In concluding our criticism of Dr. Hobart's book, we add, for the information of the curious in such matters, that out of 455 words peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel, 147 of them are quoted by Dr. Hobart; out of forty-six peculiar to the Gospel and Acts together, twenty-five of them are quoted; and out of 141 peculiar to the Acts alone, forty of them are also quoted. We use the word "peculiar" in the same sense as the author, viz., in reference to the New Testament only. Hundreds of peculiar words remain therefore unaccounted for by Dr. Hobart. But this is not all. In Matthew's Gospel there are 121 words peculiar to that Evangelist, and forty-nine favourite expressions; in Mark there are 143 peculiar words, and a goodly number of favourite expressions. Allowing for the greater Aramaic flavour of both these Gospels, and for the unreasonableness of expecting to find some of them in medical treatises, we are curious to know how many of them may there be found.

Some few are so decidedly medical that we shall be surprised if the search prove fruitless. We commend this matter to any one desirous of following in Dr. Hobart's steps.

—♦—
"THE EXPOSITOR." Nov. 1884. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THERE are four papers in the *Expositor* this month, and they are all very interesting. Dr. Cox's article on "The Harvest Cart" is simply an excellent sermon—has it ever been *preached* we wonder? Preaching from the Minor Prophets (as they are so absurdly called), for the clergy in general; is open to the serious objection that the immense majority of any ordinary congregation know simply nothing whatever about Jewish history. As the late Dean Stanley says, "Many who would be scandalised at ignorance of the battles of Salamis and Cannae, know and care nothing for the battles of Beth-horon and Megiddon." ("Jewish Church" Preface). And in consequence a series of writings containing some of the finest poetry and some of the most valuable lessons in all literature, are practically a sealed book. Still more do these remarks apply to the third article, that by Dr. A. B. Davidson, continuing the subject of Isaiah xi. to lxi., and therein discussing the question, Who did the prophet mean by the "Servant of the Lord"? "No one will say that the prophet's language regarding the 'Servant' is easy to explain," says Dr. Davidson, and we defer to the authority. But, with all sincere deference, after reading those chapters, with the keenest enjoyment, in the Hebrew—it would be worth while learning Hebrew merely to read them—we did not doubt that to the prophet the "servant" was the returning exiles personified. The "Great Unknown" charges them to be, amongst the other nations of the world, that educational force which a nation refined and purified by the fires of adversity might be. The ideal held out by him before the eyes of this noble band of true patriots was indeed a noble ideal, and at one time it might almost have seemed that it might, under Nehemiah, be realized, and the new nation have indeed become "a light of the Gentiles." But the ideal failed, as in human hands ideals always do; but the promises of God are without repentance and in the divine hands of His Son, God fulfilled for us the ideal in perfection.

—♦—
THE secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society writes to say that the society was not included in the comprehensive designation "Home Missions of the Church of England," prefixed to a circular of invitation to the recent Home Missionary Conference at the National Society's rooms.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has received the letter of the Church Council of Natal, asking certain English Bishops to nominate a successor to the late Bishop Colenso. It is not likely that the Bishops here will take any step in the matter until after the conferences between the two ecclesiastical parties in Natal have terminated.—*Daily News*.

THE Bishop of Manchester is to take the chair at the concluding meeting of the first conference of the clergy and officers connected with the Church Army, to be held (D.V.) December 3rd, 4th, and 5th, at the Peters Street Hall, Manchester. Previously to this he will give an address at the celebration in the neighbouring church.

ON Saturday the Rev. J. Rowland West, vicar of Wrawby, was installed by the Dean of Lincoln in the prebendal stall of Heydown, West Waltham, conferred on him by the Bishop of Lincoln. Mr. West was formerly Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, but took his degree at Trinity, where he was a pupil of the late Dr. Whewell and Archdeacon Julius C. Hare. He attained the high place of Fourth Wrangler in a very distinguished year, the tripos list of which includes the names of the present Bishop of Winchester, the late Dean Alford, Dr. Cookson, late Master of Peterhouse; Dr. Thompson, Master of Trinity; Mr. Law Lushington, Mr. G. Stovin Venables, Archdeacons Allen and Maddison, and the late Lord Milton. Mr. West is the author of several volumes of sermons on the Church and Christian ordinances.

ON the 23rd ult. the Bishop of Exeter reopened the parish church of Abbots Kerswell, near Newton Abbot, which had undergone a complete restoration under the care of Mr. Butterfield. His lordship preached from Eccl. iii. 11. At the luncheon his lordship said he very much questioned whether in the long run it was not cheaper to build a beautiful church, or to restore an old church to beauty, than to put up an ugly one, because when a church was really beautiful, and the people began to love it, they would contribute towards the support of its beauty with no great strain upon themselves, and with a real pleasure in the giving. The poor could not have beautiful things in their own houses, and if a beautiful church were built they could enjoy its beauty without any difficulty and cost to themselves. And they did enjoy such a building, and felt moreover that, although other people had erected it, it was their own church, and that they had a right to it even though they had given nothing but pennies towards its cost. The restoration in this case was chiefly promoted by Mrs. Marcus Hare as a memorial of her husband, the captain of the ill-fated Eurydice. It has cost £1,400.

ON All Saints' Day the church at Rangemore, near Burton-on-Trent, the seat of Sir Arthur Bass, M.P., was consecrated by the Bishop of Lichfield, and dedicated to All Saints. At the same time a piece of ground, containing about 600 square yards, which has recently been given by Sir Arthur Bass, and included within the churchyard wall, was also consecrated. By the addition to the yard the church is made to stand in the middle of an oblong quadrangle, which has been beautifully planted and is carefully kept. The main part of the churchyard was consecrated by Bishop Selwyn, in 1872, but the church itself, though erected fifteen years ago, and used regularly for service since, had not been consecrated. The services on November 1 included a celebration of the Holy Communion at 8 o'clock, the special service for the consecration at 11.30, and Evensong at 4.30. The consecration service was followed by a shortened form of Morning Prayer, the prayers being read by the vicar, the Rev. A. Lowe. After the hymn "We love the Place, O Lord," the Bishop preached from 1 Cor. i. 2, "Sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints," drawing from his text, with singular felicity and beauty, lessons to be associated with the festival of All Saints' and the consecration of a church and churchyard. In the churchyard the hymn "Let Saints on Earth in Concert Sing" was beautifully rendered by the choir. Before giving the Blessing the Bishop addressed a few further words to the people, and paid a touching tribute to the memory of the late Mr. Bass, the founder of the church and

schools. Throughout the day the weather was most propitious. In the evening the choir and ringers were entertained at dinner by Sir Arthur Bass.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Adams, Rev. F. A., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Saviour's, Paddington; Senior Curate of St. Michael's, Bowes Park, Southgate.
- Apter, Rev. William, Rector of Denton, Darlington.
- Ashpitel, Rev. Francis, Vicar of Flitwick; Rural Dean of the Deanery of Amptill.
- Bannister, Rev. Henry Marriott, Curate-in-Charge of St. John-the-Baptist Mission, Newport, Mon.; Vicar of All Saints', Winterbourne Down, Bristol.
- Benson, Rev. William John, M.A., Vicar of Kenton, Suffolk.
- Birehall, Rev. Oswald, M.A., Rector of Buscot, Berks.
- Bishop, Rev. Rhys, M.A., Rector of Willersley.
- Bodkin, Rev. William Douglas, M.A., Assistant Master in Highgate School; Vicar of Ringwood-with-Harbridge and Bisterne.
- Calvert, Rev. William, Perpetual Curate of St. Peter, Dulwich Common.
- Clayton, Rev. Horace Evelyn, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene with St. George-the-Martyr, Oxford.
- Cort, Rev. J. P., B.A., Vicar of St. Anne's, Sale, Cheshire.
- De Renzi, Rev. G. C., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Chad, West Cosely.
- Griffith, Rev. Robert C. F., Vicar of Colnbrook, near Slough; Vicar of Abingdon, Berks.
- Hatfield, Rev. T. S., A.K.C., Association Secretary for Northern Counties to the Missions to Seamen.
- Lushington, Rev. T. G. L., M.A., Vicar of Swavesey.
- Macleod, Rev. Roderick Charles, B.A., Rector of Conington.
- Milling, Rev. Matthew John Tyre, B.A., Vicar of Ashton Keynes, with the Chapelry of Leigh, Wilts.
- Payne, Rev. Edward James Undy, Vicar of Coggs, Oxon.
- Richards, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Little Raveley.
- Robinson, Rev. William, Vicar of Holme; Rector of St. Margaret's, York.
- Rooke, Rev. Edward, Rector of Holy Trinity, Micklethorpe, York.
- Sandes, Rev. E. A. B., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
- Staekhouse, R. J. L., Vicar of Berkeley.
- Statham, Rev. S. P. H., Chaplain to H.M. Forees.
- Stocks, Rev. John Edward, M.A., Vicar of Market Harborough; Vicar of St. Saviour's Leicester.
- Stone, Rev. William, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mark, Deptford.
- Tilbury, Rev. Robert, M.A., Incumbent of Hutton Magna, and Curate of Barningham; Vicar of Brignall.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Alington, Rev. Richard Pye, forty-seven years Rector of Swinhope and Stenigot, at Swinhope Rectory, on the 3rd inst., aged 75.
- Cross, Rev. John, for twenty-four years Rector of Muresley, Bucks, on the 9th inst., aged 57.
- Dalby, Rev. Robert, M.A., late Vicar of Belton, Leicestershire, Rural Dean and Chaplain to Earl Ferrers, at Castle Donington, in the same county, on the 4th inst., aged 76.
- Elwes, Rev. William J., fourth son of the late T. M. Elwes, Esq., of Bossington House, Stockbridge, at Hilleote, Eastbourne, on the 8th inst., aged 46.
- Fothergill-Cooke, Rev. Thomas, M.A., at 61, Pulteney Street, Bath, on the 5th inst., aged 70.
- Green, Rev. George Arthur, M.A., at Bishop's Stortford, on the 2nd inst., aged 69.
- Knight, Rev. John Stigand, M.A., Chaplain H.M.S. *Neptune*, at Tower House, Salisbury, on the 10th inst., aged 32.
- Pollard, Rev. Henry Smith, M.A., Line. Coll., Oxford, twenty-seven years Vicar of Coombe Bissett and Homington, Wilts, at the Vearage, Coombe Bissett, on the 4th inst., aged 74.
- Randell, Rev. James, late Rector of Ifield, Kent, on the 8th inst., aged 57.
- Read, Rev. William, M.A., at Worthing, Sussex, on the 8th inst., aged 85.
- Saulz, Rev. George A. F., M.A., Rector of Exton, Hants, at Ealing, suddenly, on the 7th inst., aged 71.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ELIJAH AND ELISHA.

BY THE REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED AT PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON
SUNDAY, AUGUST 31ST, 1884.

"And it came to pass, when the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven by a whirlwind, that Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal."—2 KINGS ii. 1.

THE translation or assumption of Elijah probably interests more people, and interests them more powerfully, than any event, with one or two exceptions, at most, in the Old Testament. Elijah himself is always interesting; he interests us as children on account of the variety and splendour of his adventures; and he interests us still more as men on account of his unique place in sacred history, and his value as a study of character. Of the two great figures which the wild highland race of Gilead contributed to the history of Israel—Jephthah and Elijah—Elijah is incomparably the more commanding; great in himself, he was made greater by the circumstances with which he was in almost perpetual conflict. To the settled communities of Judah and Ephraim he must have worn almost as strange a look as he would present could he appear in Regent-street or Ludgate-hill, with his long, dark hair hanging down his back, with his skin-girdle round his waist, and his cape of sheepskin, or mantle, as it is called, thrown loosely across his shoulders. When, from time to time, Elijah appeared—no one could exactly say whence—it was felt that something evil had been done, or that something tragical was impending. Elijah was emphatically a prophet of judgment; his life was a long struggle against the apostasy from the moral law and worship of the Lord God of Israel, to which at that time the court of Israel was so unhappily committed. This it was which led him to proclaim the penal drought of three years' duration to Ahab, to confront Ahab when, with Obadiah, he was making a survey of the impoverished land, to bid him summon the eight hundred and fifty prophets of Baal and Ashtaroth to their judgment and doom in Carmel, to denounce to Ahab the appointed visitation of God in the garden of the murdered Naboth outside his royal city Jezreel, to foretell to Ahaziah his approaching death when he had sent to the heathen oracle of Ekron to ascertain the issue of his illness, to call down fire upon the companies of soldiers who were sent to take him in

his hermitage on Mount Carmel, and even to send a letter to the apostatising King of Judah, Jehoram, announcing his approaching end. And it was this struggle against fashionable evil which forced Elijah again and again to seek safety by partaking himself to some remote hiding place, at one time in the torrent bed of the Cherith, which ran like a deep fissure through his native hills at Gilead; at another, strange enough, in the very heart of the country of his enemies, with the widow woman of Zarephath, between Tyre and Sidon; at another in the territory of Judah itself, at Beersheba; at another amid the rocky precipices of Horeb, the scene of the greatest of his visions; at another in caves on the sides of Carmel. His life was by turns that of a statesman whose strong will swayed the fall and rise of kingdoms, and that of a hermit whose long visions and prayers were unwitnessed by any human eye; and now this life, so active and so passive, so strong and so yielding, so courageous, and at times so verging upon despair, has come to an end. The prophet is at Gilgal, the village we can hardly doubt of that name in Samaria, when he is told that the time of his departure is at hand. "And it came to pass, when the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven by a whirlwind, that Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal."

The verse before us directs attention to a point which evidently has a first place in the writer's mind, which, in fact, governs its narrative; it is that at this supreme moment of his life Elijah was not alone; he "went with Elisha from Gilgal." The narrative which follows is not more an account of Elijah's passing away into another world than of Elisha's relation to him at the time, and we shall, perhaps, consider it most usefully if we place ourselves at the point of view of the servant rather than that of the master, and accompany Elisha from Gilgal to the closing scene beyond the Jordan. There are characters and subjects which, like the orb of the sun at noon-day, cannot be gazed at directly; they are best understood if we stand a little aside to look at them, or try to measure their import by tracing its effect on the conduct and the destiny of others.

And here we note first the strong over-mastering affection which bound Elisha to Elijah. Ever since Elisha's call at Abel-meholah he had been generally in Elijah's company, on the footing at once of a trusted younger companion and of a confidential servant—the same sort of relation that existed between Moses and Joshua as a preparation of the duties to which Joshua would be called after the great law-giver's death; it was a relationship on one side of fatherly affection, on the other of devoted and reverent service; Elisha's title of honour in his later years, was "the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah." The phrase was vivid; it implied that the solitary, stern, reserved prophet admitted his

younger friend to the high honour of intimate service, and that this had been gratefully accepted. And so they moved through life, the wisdom of years, and of commanding inspiration, leaning, as it might seem, on the active enthusiasm of generous youth, and deepening mutual attachment by the interchange of what each had to give—strong grasp of truth, patient thought, wise counsel, on the one side, and all the varied attentions of loving service on the other. But now Elijah had been warned that the end was near, and he would rather be alone. Much was before him which none could fully understand. Elijah would be alone. Solitude was never unwelcome to Elijah; it never is unwelcome to those who have a real sense of the presence of God, and who find in communion with Him, and in discovering more and more of their own conditions with respect to His known will, more than enough to occupy them. They only are entirely dependent on the society of their fellow-creatures who live on the surface of their existence, and who have no true experience whatever of that which lies beneath. A great soul, too, like Elijah, has its appropriate and its inevitable reserves, while shallower natures talk glibly of all that passes within them, and find a satisfaction in taking the world into their confidence. More solid characters will shrink from this exposure, just as a deep volume of water rolls on in silence towards the ocean, while a shallow brook ripples chatteringly over its rocky bed, and proclaims to all the world how small are its resources. Nor does the love of solitude at certain times in life imply a lack of sympathy, since true sympathy has other and better ways of expressing itself than by incessant talking.

Of when we pine afar from those we love,
 More close are knit the spirit's sympathies
 By mutual prayer; distance itself doth prove
 Greater nearness, and with such stronger ties
 Spirit with spirit talks, that when our eyes
 Behold each other, something sinks within,
 Mocked by the touch of life's realities.

Nor in desiring to be alone was Elijah thinking only of himself; no doubt he wished to spare his faithful companion the pain of parting. If Elisha would only remain at Gilgal he would hear somewhere, and at some time, that his beloved master had at last disappeared. There would be no picture of a scene, engraven never to be blotted out from his memory, to haunt Elisha's life; there would only be the contrast, the great contrast, between visible presence and felt absence; all the connecting links would belong to conjecture. So out of affection for Elisha, no less than from personal feeling and preference, Elijah would have said unto Elisha, "Tarry here, I pray thee; for the Lord hath sent me to Bethel." But affection like Elisha's does not always enter into motives which would have ruled Elijah; it takes, indeed, no thought of self if it is true affection; it would rather suffer from being close to its object than

escape suffering by distance from its object; and it is too impetuous not unfrequently to be entirely considerate, like those warm-hearted foreigners who, thinking only of the immediate satisfaction of some sentiment of attachment, clasp some reserved English friend to their arms in the public streets. Elisha did not care for the pain which the sight of the departing Elijah might cause him, and he could not stop to understand the yearning for solitude which in those solemn moments the great prophet would assuredly feel; and hence the exclamation, "As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." At Bethel, and again at Jericho, Elijah renewed the request that Elisha would remain behind; at Bethel and again at Jericho, and in the same terms, Elisha refused; he would cling to his great master to the last, no matter what he might have to endure in doing so; they should be parted, if at all, by a higher than any human judgment; and each time—and this is remarkable—Elijah gave way. That iron will, before which kings and captains quailed in terror, bent with obedient sympathy to the reiterated protestation of an affectionate servant; they were together through the whole of that last journey—at Gilgal, at Bethel, at Jericho, and at the last beyond the Jordan.

We may have seen something of the same kind in a last illness—an illness extended, like Elijah's last journey, over three or more stages before the end is reached. There is the first stage when it is understood that things are looking serious—the stage from Gilgal to Bethel; and then there is a halt, and we think, we hope, that recovery is probable; and then comes a second stage, from Bethel to Jericho, when a new advance is made in the downward course, and the gravest apprehensions are entertained. But then at Jericho comes another halt; again hope, hope which is ever buoyant and optimising, flickers up into the belief that convalescence is possible, until the illness takes a final, fatal turn, and the patient sets out to cross that dark river which is never repassed. Few of us are like the saintly solitary of ancient Israel, so plunged in the sense of the encompassing presence of God as to desire no created sympathy to supplement the satisfaction which is drawn from felt contact with the uncreated and the infinite; few of us can lie down to die like that great figure of the middle ages at Salerno, with the exclamation, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile." Most of us yearn at that solemn time for human words of love and pity, and human faces and human hands, which shall soften, if they cannot delay, the stern approach of death, and human friends who shall accompany us to the gate, if there they must leave us and can pass no further. But a long illness, with its three or more stages continued week after week, month after month, is a trial even to devoted affection. Affection is sometimes keen

between Gilgal and Bethel; it is cooler between Bethel and Jericho; and too often it is scarcely better than a mechanical service in the latest stage. To be tended by the love of an Elisha is a great blessing; to be an Elisha to some solitary soul, which in its isolation scarcely dares reveal itself to any one human heart, is perhaps a greater. Such experiences, such duties, do come to most of us, sooner or later in life; but Elisha little thought, when he first set eyes on Elijah in the meadow of Abel-meholah, that he would be the witness of those last hours between Gilgal and the Jordan.

And next we may note the vexations and annoyances to which Elisha's devotion to his master exposed him during the last hours of Elijah's life. At Bethel and Jericho there were schools of the prophets—institutions these which had dated from the days of Samuel. In these establishments young men who had, or were thought likely to possess, the prophetic gift were taught the meaning, especially the moral meaning, of the sacred law and the whole body of truth which the prophetic order has gradually learnt from the more eminent of its inspired members. These schools of the prophets were more like diocesan colleges for training young men for holy orders than any other institutions among us. They were centres of religious information and religious influence, houses in which the spirit of the order of the prophets was carefully fostered and strengthened, and from which issued forth men who were profoundly influenced the religious convictions and conduct of their contemporaries. Such schools or colleges there were at Ramah, at Bethel, at Jericho, at Gilgal, and elsewhere. Some of them were very numerous attended; all of them were of real importance to the religious life of the country. Now, Elijah's lofty character and conspicuous services would have won the heart and kindled the imagination of the young men who attended these prophetic colleges, and it is possible that in making his way towards the Jordan, the frontier of his own native Gilead, where he hoped to die, he so shaped his course as to be able to take solemn leave of the great communities which were settled in Bethel and in Jericho. From Gilgal the travellers arrived first of all at Bethel, and here the members of the prophetic college showed what we must at least think a great want of consideration for Elisha. Somehow or other, whether through a revelation conveyed to some other prophet or through a report of what Elijah had been saying at Gilgal, and possibly elsewhere, the rumour was already in circulation at Bethel that Elijah would soon be leaving the world. The school of the prophets of Bethel do not seem to have looked upon Elisha with very favourable eyes; they probably regarded him as an inferior sort of person who had arrived at an eminence, which he did not really deserve, through his

association with the great Elijah. Elisha, it is probable, had never had any connection with these prophetic schools, and their members may have been disposed to regard him as some clergyman who have had a University education are said to regard other clergymen who have never been at a University. Men are really to be valued not by their antecedents or decorations, or the accidents of their education, but by what they are in themselves, by what God's wonder-working grace has made them, by their moral and intellectual endowments, by their place in, and above all their work for, the Church. But human nature is much the same in its leading characteristics from age to age, and the members of the prophetic college at Bethel reflected with some sort of satisfaction that when Elijah was withdrawn Elisha, at any rate, would find his level. It was not disagreeable to them to tell Elisha what was coming, and to observe the effect that the news would have upon him. "And the sons of the prophets that were at Jericho came to Elisha, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day? And he answered, Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace." The same ill-natured question was put to Elisha by the members of the college of prophets at Jericho, and it elicited from Elisha the same reply. There was plainly a common understanding, a feeling running throughout the prophetic order, to which the question gave expression, and the strength of the feeling may be measured by the fact that even the presence of Elijah did not silence the questioners; their jealousy of Elisha, it seems, was too keen to allow them to understand what was due to the last hours of the great prophet who was so soon to leave them. It has been within the experience of some of us, I suppose, that the pettinesses of human nature are by no means always awed into silence by the presence of death. Nothing is more melancholy in the annals of royalty than the under-current of selfish intrigue and gossip which so often surrounds the dying moments of a sovereign; the scramble for place and power is with difficulty, if at all, delayed until the last breath of the dying ruler has been drawn; the rivalries which have hitherto been repressed by an instinct of prudence will break out ever prematurely into most unlovely forms of activity, and display on a truly pathetic scale the hollowness of the life whose outward mien has been that of a perfectly sincere and easy courtesy. Nor need we have recourse to memoirs of Court life to illustrate this insensibility of selfish passion to all that is implied in the presence of death. In very humble families a death is often discounted long before it has actually taken place; keen eyes picture to themselves the altered circumstances of the family, the new social centre of gravity, the new distribution of income, the putting down the influential from their seat and exalting those who wish to take

their place, the new domestic order which will unfold itself when the will has been read and its disappointments and its surprises have been duly appreciated. You know, my brethren, whether I am exaggerating. But Elisha's questioners are often asking their question, as it seems to me, under new circumstances: "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?" and wherever the solemnity of death is understood the profanity of introducing these topics is understood, too, and the answer of every reverent and healthy soul is that of Elisha—"Yea, I do know it; hold ye your peace."

And, lastly, there was the solemn interchange of confidences between the parting prophet and his successor. If the last hours of a friend's or relation's life often make heavy demands on affection, if the sickroom has sometimes its trials, and, we must add, its degradation, it also, and that not seldom, has blessings that are all its own. Elisha had resisted Elijah's last injunction to stay at Jericho, and he had turned a deaf ear to the question addressed to him by the local college of prophets. Elijah and Elisha had walked across the plain in full view of the associated fifty prophets who were gathered to watch them from the rocky heights behind the town of Jericho, and when Elijah had smitten with his mantle the waters of the Jordan, they passed to its eastern side—the side of Elijah's native Gilead. And now the closing scene is imminent. But before it took place, the departing prophet, as if at last recognising the devoted affection of the man who, in spite of his own injunctions and remonstrances, had followed him from Gilgal, wished to give a token of interest and gratitude: "Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away from thee." It is the command of one who knows that he has power with God, and is too sincere to disguise it. Prayer moves the will that moves the world, and those who have been for long years living near the Almighty may speak of answers to prayers with a humble yet decided confidence which would be folly or irreverence in other men. "Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away from thee." What was Elisha's answer? He is on his trial, as was Solomon in the vision or dream at Gibeon; he is balancing, perhaps, for the moment, between matter and spirit, between earthly ambition or gain and the generous promptings of disinterested service. "Ask what I shall do for thee." What should Elisha ask? Should it be long life, or great wealth, or the humiliation of personal rivals? Solomon had not asked for these; Solomon had asked for nothing material, nothing base or selfish, but for a spirit of wisdom that would enable him to rule his people; and Elisha must ask for that which in the Prophet would answer to the royal gift of wisdom—a double portion of the spirit of his master. This has been often misunderstood to mean a propheti-

cal gift twice as great in its range and its intensity as that which was entrusted to Elijah. If that were the meaning of the phrase, Elisha's prayer, we must say, was not granted. It cannot be said that Elisha, startling as were his miracles, occupied so great a place in the line of the prophets as did Elijah. He is, indeed, as a type of our Lord, greater than the type of our Lord's forerunner; but in their whole manner of life and conduct the two prophets differ too widely to admit properly of being compared at all. Elijah was a recluse, leading a life for the most part remote from the haunts of men; Elisha was a dweller in cities, on familiar terms with his fellow men, sharing their habits, influencing their lives by constant contact. Elijah belonged properly to the desert; Elisha to civilization. Elijah was a destructive, the sworn enemy of all persons and institutions which interfered with the honour of the Lord God of Israel. Elisha's career was constructive and conciliatory; his relations with Naaman the Syrian, to go no further, are perfectly inconceivable in the acts of Elijah; he was the friend and adviser of influential persons, he was welcome at the Court; a king mourned by the side of his dying bed. In Elijah's case the miracles were but illustrations of character; in Elisha's, character only forms a thin link between the successive miracles. In short, the whole disposition and career of the two prophets differs so that the specific spirit of Elijah was so far from being doubled in Elisha that it was scarcely reproduced in him at all. The phrase surely points to the general prophetic gift, and Elisha asks that he might receive not twice as great a gift as his master, but, as the Hebrew term exactly implies, the double portion of an eldest son—twice as much as any other prophet. But Elijah hesitates. Elisha, he says, has asked a hard thing. Elijah may be able, by his intercession, to procure the boon, but, also, he may fail. If Elisha sees him at the moment of his departure, then the prayer will have been granted—it will only have been granted if he does see him. Elisha's motive for such a request will seem clear enough if we put ourselves in his place. The fortunes of the true religion in Israel were still at a very low ebb, and in losing Elijah it seemed that good men, the remnant that had not bowed the knee to Baal, were losing everything. What a blank, what a hopeless, desolate prospect lay before them when the great prophet should have gone! Who would then uphold the unpopular truth? Who would then withstand the powerful idolatry? Who would then inspire the evil with apprehension, and encourage and strengthen the hearts that fail? It was not for himself, it was that he might still be able to do something for others, that Elisha asked for a double portion of the prophetic spirit. In the Church of Jesus Christ the individual counts for less than in the Jewish Church, just as in

Judaism he counted less than in Paganism. No single death can possibly be to Christendom what Elijah's death was to the religion of Israel. Christians know that the greatness of a St. Paul or St. Augustine is the work of the Holy Spirit, and that what he has done once he may do again. The individual, too, whose value is so great in an imperfect, a local religious system, seems insignificant when he is confronted with the majesty of the universal Church; and when, in Christendom, men speak as though this or that loss were irreparable, they surely know not what spirit they are of. No loss is irreparable in His kingdom who perpetually makes all things new, and on whom the greatest and the humblest of His servants are equally dependent for all that they have and that they are. To most of us Elisha's prayer would be safely paraphrased without reference to what may have been given to or withheld from others. The most essential feature of the prophetic spirit is shed abroad in Christian hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us; it is a sense of the love of God.

I ask not wealth, I ask not length of days,
Nor joys which home and rural scenes bestow;
Nor honour among men, nor poet's praise,
Nor friendship, nor the light of love to know,
Which with its own warm sun bathes all below;
Nor that the seed I sow should harvest prove.
I ask not health, nor spirits gladly flow,
Nor an assured pledge of rest above,
If only Thou wilt give a heart to know Thy love.

But the value to Elisha in after-life of that parting scene was independent of and higher than the great gift which it won for him. The last solemn communications, the reply, the answer, and then nothing more but the chariots of fire and the horses of fire and the repetition of the answer—the elevation of the scene—was beyond language; but Elisha could not refrain even then from the cry, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof." There is nothing quite like it in all sacred history; it is above the silent removal of Enoch from earth; it is far below the calm majesty of the Ascension, when no chariots of fire were needed to sweep the risen body of the Redeemer from the earth, "when, as they beheld, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight." And yet, at the moment of death, often has heaven been opened to the humblest Christian; and He, who in Elijah's case made the flames of fire His ministers, displayed Himself to St. Stephen even before the soul had parted from the body. In any case the outward accompaniments of the departure from this world of a great and saintly soul are less important than the fact itself. Some who hear me may have been present at death-beds which they will never forget; some, very probably, will some day be present at them, and may remember what is now said to them. Few events in life are of such vital bearing on our eternal state as these high and rare ex-

periences. To be at the bedside of a dying Christian, to listen to his last words, to join in his last prayers, to partake, it may be, of what is his last communion, is to know something of Elisha's feelings beyond the Jordan, something of the mind of the Apostles on the Mount of the Transfiguration, on the Mount of the Ascension; nay, in such scenes Calvary and Tabor are strangely blended—the physical suffering with the lofty and the transcendental calm, the visible break-up of the poor human framework with the spiritual illumination which is shed from the chariots of fire and the horses of fire that are already on their way from Paradise. For, if so much were possible under the old law—a shadow from first to last of the things to come—what may not be, what has not been possible, for Christians with whom our Lord and Saviour incarnate, crucified, interceding, is present, ready to save to the utmost those who come unto God by Him? To witness a Christian death-bed is to witness not a triumph of human energy, or composure, or fortitude, but a display of His sustaining and invigorating grace, the mercy and the majesty of the Redeemer rendered visible in the peace and joy of the redeemed. Faith does not now see the chariots of fire and the horses of fire, but she listens for words which, since the consecration on Calvary, mean infinitely more. "Into Thy hands I commend My spirit, for Thou hast redeemed Me, O Lord God of Truth."

THE China Inland Mission has recruited the services of some very well known rowing and cricketing men at Cambridge, and there were three meetings last week and one on Sunday afternoon to bid them farewell. There are several other men who intend to offer themselves for work in connection with the Church Missionary Society. This is an interesting result of a very genuine religious movement which has been going on quietly among undergraduates of various colleges for some years past, and which attracted a good deal of attention when Messrs. Moody and Sankey were invited here two years ago.

ON Monday evening there was a meeting of the Church of England Purity Association in New College Hall, Oxford. The Bishop of Exeter gave an address of wonderful earnestness and power, in which he urged that the terrible social evils of modern life could only be effectually attacked by the promotion of purity among men, and called on his hearers to take their part in the great movement which was making itself felt throughout England, and to assist in the awakening of the public conscience, by joining the association, and by the use of that influence which was often exercised by the expression of a face or the tone of a voice. The President of the Association, Canon Scott Holland, also spoke a few words. The hall was full of undergraduates, and among those on the dais were the President of Trinity, the Provost of Worcester, the Warden of Keble, and other influential members of the University.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1884.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S CHARGE.

OUR last number dealt with an episcopal charge, composed and delivered in the fullest consciousness of the critical nature of the times in which we live—of the questions at issue, and of the changes impending. To-day we have the contrast, most delightful, if it were but in accordance with facts, of a bishop happily unconscious of the existence of any crisis at all. The Bishop of London says :—

“It may be the teaching of long experience, or it may be only the narrowing vision of old age, which makes us believe that the real work entrusted to us to do—the bringing the Gospel into contact with the hearts of men, in our pulpits, our mission-rooms, our schools, and our pastoral visits—is very little affected by the play of controversy which may be going on in matters ecclesiastical, and which, however important, may be settled either way or not be settled at all, without influencing in any appreciable degree the spiritual well-being or the eternal destinies of the souls committed to our charge.”

In accordance with this statement, the Bishop's effort, throughout his charge, is to minimise the importance of the questions on which his clergy differ, and to induce them to confine their attention, with himself, to those more superficial and external matters, upon which all are able to co-operate and agree. We wish to consider to-day whether this mode of treatment of the ecclesiastical questions at present in controversy, is wise, or even possible. Let us ask first, What are these questions of which the Bishop thinks so slightly? Beginning from the employment which he himself suggests to his clergy—that of bringing the Gospel into contact with the hearts of men—are his clergy in any wise agreed as to what that Gospel is? Further, whereas in the days when he himself

was formed and trained to pastoral work there was an universally acknowledged book to whose standard all such questions must be referred, and in whose pages, if anywhere, that Gospel must be found: now that book is doubted everywhere, and its genuineness, authenticity, and authority have given rise to some of the most prominent questions of the day. Or did the bishop allude to those still deeper questions relating to the being of God, and the origin and future destiny of man, each of which is being answered around us by some negatively, by some positively, while by others they are dismissed as quite unanswerable? Of these questions he, living at the centre of the thought and action of the world, and entrusted with the oversight of the largest and most prominent of all the moral and religious institutions of that metropolis, is not unconscious. The following is his own survey of the intellectual world in which he lives :—

“Infidelity the religion of multitudes, with its propaganda, its preachers and its literature, sometimes able and acute, sometimes obscene and blasphemous; and a large section professing neither belief nor unbelief, but satisfied to live here without perplexing themselves about a problematical hereafter. . . . And through the ranks of the more educated and refined there runs a view of unbelief or scepticism, often displayed on the surface, more often concealed beneath the cover of a cold respect for a religion, the truth of which is doubted or silently denied.”

This is the Bishop's own view of the general spirit of questioning that pervades the world. Nor is he ignorant that the same spirit, penetrating within the Church, is ever urging minds in two opposite directions. We quote again :—

“Transubstantiation, purgatory, masses for the dead, the invocation of the Virgin and saints, and confession to the priest with the view of obtaining absolution as the needful condition of forgiveness of sins, and the necessary preparation for admission to Holy Communion, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, a negative suppression of the true God-head of the Saviour under the phrase of a Divine Person, and of the personality of the Holy Ghost under that of a Divine Influence, a practical denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures by attributing a similar inspiration to the utterances of poets and philosophers, and doubt thrown over the Resurrection itself by suggesting the physical impossibility of miracles.”

Are these the questions, within the Church and without it, which the Bishop, with tranquil optimism, considers “may be settled either way, or not be settled at all, without influencing in any appreciable degree the spiritual well-being or the eternal destinies of the souls committed to our charge?” Or does he merely allude to the questions that relate to the “doctrinal errors of the Church of Rome,” a long list of which, as held by certain of his clergy, we have just transcribed in his lordship's own words. We imagine that this last is the correct interpretation and that these are the “ecclesiastical questions” to which in the first passage, which we cited out of the charge, his Lordship alludes. He had been accused of calling, sending, commissioning, and licensing persons to preach and teach and exer-

cise pastoral functions in his diocese, on the express understanding that they should continue teaching everyone of that long list of errors. His reply is to minimise the importance of the practices and doctrines, which he still, though very faintly, condemns. Such questions, he thinks, may be settled either way, or not settled at all, without influencing in any appreciable degree the spiritual welfare of souls. Let us ask what these questions are. They resolve themselves chiefly into two—Whether a material object, over which a priest has offered incantations or prayers, is to be supposed to contain the Deity, and as such to be adored? and whether the soul that feels burdened with sin is to seek its release from the priest, or direct from God, the Searcher of the heart. All the external ceremonial recently impugned, where it is not a mere unmeaning theatrical display, is adopted with the express intention of inculcating worship of the material object, or confidence in the supernatural powers of the priest, for idolatry, or for sacerdotalism. And it is the questions relating to these practices and these doctrines which the Bishop of London considers so indifferent. Does he not see that religion, if it is to retain any binding power (*religare*), must be real and true, that Gospel, if it is to be a Gospel, must be based on facts? And, therefore, that the first duty of his clergy is not to preach as Gospel any chance arrangement of cant phrases, but to get the clearest idea that they can attain of what that Gospel really is? The first duty of the clergyman is to hold the truth; his second to exhibit that truth, so that it may favourably affect the people. We hope to return in our next to the larger, and more external, portion of the Bishop's charge.

SOCIAL PURITY.

BY THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

HIS LORDSHIP, in introducing this subject at the Diocesan Conference, said:—

It was now his duty to bring before the members that very grave and very important question which was the last they had to discuss at that Conference—"Is it desirable that a branch of the Church of England Purity Society be formed in this diocese?" A speaker might be tempted to say, in introducing this question, that he did so with hesitation and with difficulty. He (the Bishop) might truthfully say that he had no hesitation in bringing the subject before them, nor could he, nor ought he to have much difficulty in what he had to say respecting it. He had no hesitation whatever in bringing it before the Conference, because no man ought to hesitate in the discharge of a plain and imperative duty, and he believed that if there were a duty plain and imperative upon them as members of the Church of Jesus Christ it was to do what in them lay for the promotion of the purity of human life. The distinctive glory of the Christian religion was that it was a

religion that aimed at purity. Our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world to make human life pure. For our sakes, He told us, He purified Himself, and He had come into the world that He should give us of that nature; and those who preached Him to the world bade men to be pure, even as He is pure. "Having this hope we purify ourselves." The religion of Jesus Christ was a religion of purity, purity of heart, and of universal purity. When he said "universal purity" he meant purity for all who were members of the society which He founded. Now, in this respect it seemed to him that the religion of which they were believers and followers differed essentially from all other religions the world had ever known. Other religions had attained to a very high degree of morality, and set forth certain maxims of purity, but the Christian religion was distinguished in this, that it required from all its members inherent purity of thought and speech, as well as of purity of life and deed, and that it professed to enable men to live that life of purity by the communication to them of the pure nature of Jesus Christ Himself. Therefore, as Christians, any question concerning purity of life in a nation had to the Church to which they belonged a vital importance. And then, as citizens merely, there was no citizen in this country, who was thoughtful of what were the true springs of a nation's life and happiness, who would not hold that social purity lay at the very base of them all. What the family life of a nation was that the nation's life must be, and where the family life was corrupt or tainted it could never be in the highest sense a nation at all. Purity was the main spring and base of national life and national happiness, and if there were anything which weakened the purity of family life, so far was the life of the nation weakening and decaying. Hence the social purity of the nation concerned the Conference most intimately. Of all the evils that could assail a nation's life this was the most deadly. Physically, morally, socially, its evils and mischiefs were deep, wide-reaching, and long-lasting. We could not speak too strongly of the dangers of intemperance, and could not work too strongly against these evils; but he was bound to say, having given thought and study to this question, that the evils of impurity and the dangers of it to our national life were deeper, wider, and further reaching than even the evils of intemperance. Intemperance, evil as it was, affected but a small portion, comparatively, of a nation. The drunkard was comparatively rare. He dared not think, and he knew it was not the case, that a man of impure life was as comparatively rare as the drunkard. The evils of intemperance were upon the surface and visible; but the evils of impurity were below the surface and often invisible and concealed, and for that reason were out of reach and check. Intemperance compelled attention by its outward violence and disturbance; but impurity, from its very nature, eluded attention, and hence it was like a hidden canker in the system, and burrowed deep and stretched far and wide before it was discovered. Intemperance slew its hundreds, but impurity slew its thousands. Intemperance was as the arrow that flieth by day, but impurity was the pestilence that walketh in darkness. He held, then, that as members of a civilised nation, as members of a Christian nation, as members of a Christian Church, it was incumbent upon them to watch against the growth of social impurity, and where they discovered it and when they discovered it, to do all that in them lay to check or cure it.

Now, the question which lay before them that day was whether this impurity largely existed among them, and what was the practical duty of the Church of Christ respecting it. Those who had given attention to the subject told us, with evident truth, that social impurity very largely abounded with us. We could not walk through the streets of some of our great towns without being shocked and horrified by the sights that we saw. We could not look upon the Haymarket in London, or such places in other cities, and fail to see impurity—unabashed, daring, insolent, depraved, and what should touch them far more, miserable, wretched, and unpitied. We could not walk the streets of our great towns without being moved by what one of our great poetesses—a pure-hearted woman, and because she was pure-hearted not afraid to speak of the misery, the shame, and the sorrow of the outcast of her sex—said, when she spoke of—

Thirty thousand women in one smile,
Who only smile at night beneath the gas.

There was one fact that struck him with a sense of pain and terror, and that was that the ranks of that sad army of outcasts—that army of destruction—was being recruited increasingly with younger and still younger members. It was a terrible, it was an appalling thing, that the age at which women became members of this outcast class was getting lower and lower in this country. It was a terrible thing that when we walked the streets of London and some of our great cities we were confronted (said his lordship with evident emotion) by poor little children of eleven, of ten—God help and pity them!—of nine years of age. One really shuddered when he thought what all that meant. What he had been speaking of were the open, flaunting, and visible signs of impurity, but we had not touched the depth of the matter. That impurity must be maintained and paid for; that evil army must have its recruiting sergeants and its patrons; and it was from the men of wealth, of comfortable means, from the respectable citizens, from men of all ranks and of all grades in life, even down to the very lowest, that the means are furnished for the keeping up of this evil. There was much in that direction that did not come to light, and how much did it represent when we regarded it as the oozing upwards and flowing outward of a deep well of hidden impurity? They could not measure the virtue of a nation merely by the virtue or the vice of its streets. The vice of a nation was far more widely spread than that. He did not think it desirable to go into statistics, because men admitted the reality of these facts; but he was bound to say this, that with respect to this social evil (as it had been truly described) that we sought to repress, it was a very great mistake to suppose that those who were the visible presentment of the evil were the mere victims of the false and cruel seducer. God knew the sin of the male sex was heavy in this respect, but it was only too true that much of this vice was not the work of man's seduction and treachery, but—alas! that it should be—it was the work of the female seducer—the woman who brought up and deliberately trained the child in evil ways that she might make gold of her sin and shame. But then this was not all; not nearly all. We must remember that this impurity manifested itself not only in these coarser and the sadder forms, but in other ways. It manifested itself largely in other countries in art, and largely and

increasingly in literature. Our own art was, he was glad to say, almost entirely pure, but as regarded literature, he believed few of us were aware of the immense amount of capital and wicked and fiendish ingenuity that was expended in this country upon vile and impure literature, and the number of agencies which were engaged in distributing it, and worst of all, distributing it in our public schools, both male and female.

Now he had said enough—but not one-half of what the truth was—to satisfy the Conference that at any rate there were vast evils connected with social impurity which, if it were possible, the members should endeavour to remedy. What could they do against this great evil? They had been urged to preach against it, but there were difficulties in the way of plain preaching against such an evil. There were always difficulties of speaking to a mixed congregation in such plain terms as should convey to them no knowledge of what was wrong and yet strike guilty persons with shame. He doubted whether the pulpit could go very far in this direction, but he felt bound to say he doubted whether it had gone far enough. And he would press upon his brethren to consider whether on the subject of purity they had reached the measure of the power of the pulpit. But, after all, the power of the pulpit was necessarily limited. Could we do anything else? Could we appeal to the State? Again he felt that the powers of the State were very limited, and he felt there was a great danger in State interference with vice. It was very dangerous for the State to turn a vice into a crime; the danger was that when this had been done you might enlist on the side of the vicious the sympathy of those who pitied a man for what he was compelled to suffer, and the public sentiment which should be directed against the crime would be manifested on the side of vice. There was another danger connected with this subject. We set about suppressing vice in the streets, and at first nothing seemed more simple and plausible; but when we had punished vice by suppressing it in the streets we often drove it inwards and increased it in the home. In other countries the State enactments were more strict and severe in this respect. He was not prepared to say the State in England might not go farther than it did, but he doubted much whether the social purity of the other countries he had alluded to was any better than our own. The State might and ought to interfere in the suppression of public indecency. The State might and ought to interfere in defence of physical weakness; and where the woman was injured there a crime had been committed, and there the State had a right to interfere, and he was one of those who had supported such interference. But the broad principle in State interference was "*Volenti non fit iniuria*." The State interfered to protect the young against wrong and violence and fraud, but where the person was of sufficient age to understand what the individual was doing, and freely and willingly consented to be a partner in sin, then the duty of State interference ended, and the danger of State interference began. So he repeated, what the State could do was very limited; but where the State ended the Church began. What could we, as members of Christ's Church, do to repress this great evil? One thing, alas! we could not do, we could not visit with what was truly called in the Prayer-book "ancient and godly discipline" offenders in this respect; but he hoped the time might come back when the public dis-

cipline of the Church might be brought to bear upon sins of this class. What was in our power? He believed it was in our power very largely to correct and elevate public opinion upon this question, and he believed our efforts should be mainly in that direction. Our hope of the future of the country lay mainly in bringing about a higher, nobler, purer tone of thought upon the subject than that now prevailing, and if we attained to that we should have done an immense deal. If they attained to this, that the sacred conviction of the Christian Church was that the sin was equal in both sexes, that the impure man was, in the sight of God at least, as great a sinner as, if not a greater sinner, than the impure woman, much would have been done. Unfortunately it had never been so regarded by nations, and but rarely by the Church. Men had guarded family purity as the possession of the man, because a sinful woman injured her husband and her family; but nations, as a rule, did not visit with like punishment the man who had sinned as it did the woman who had sinned; and yet how often far more excuses could be found for the sinning woman than for the sinning man. Until we could impress this opinion on society; until men would shrink from their fellow-men who were impure, as their wives would draw away and shrink with horror and distress from a fallen woman; until men had the same horror of male impurity as they had for female sin and impurity, we had not reached the root of the evil, and he thought what we ought to set ourselves to raise was a standard of purity and self-respect, of contempt and disgust for what was impure in man. Our first and main effort should be to create such a public opinion as should regard with like reprobation, and visit with like punishment, the sin of the man and the sin of the woman. In the next place, try to dry up the sources of impurity; for instance, try to deal with tainted literature; suppress it as far as we could by assisting in the prosecution of the vile poisoners of society wherever we knew or heard of them. To do so it was a painful and necessary duty that we should lend all the strength we could to the Society for the Suppression of Vice and kindred societies which were endeavouring to deal with this literature. As regarded legislation, legislators needed to be strengthened in Parliament, for although they could not do much, they could do something. He had done his best to support measures of this sort in the House of Parliament of which he was a member, and was prepared to do it again; but legislators needed much support out of doors in order to overcome a great amount of resistance indoors. Now, in what way should we set about this work? There was an association which had been recently formed for the purpose of furthering social purity. He knew there were persons who objected to special organisations of this kind, and said the Church itself was one great organisation against all this evil. In a sense that was perfectly true; but, on the other hand, if we desired to concentrate efforts and to collect facts and to obtain wise counsel to bring to bear directly upon some special evil, we needed a special organisation in these days for the purpose. The existing association was under the patronage of the Archbishops and Bishops, and the question was whether it was desirable to establish a branch of the association in the diocese or whether the diocese should keep aloof from the work. As Bishop, he might himself have organised some such association, but he had made it a rule since the Conference had been formed to attempt no

diocesan organisation and no movement on a large scale, unless he found himself guided by the council and backed up by the Conference. Therefore he asked Whether it was the opinion of the members that there should be a branch of the Church of England Purity Society formed in this diocese?

On the motion of the Rev. H. S. Syers, of Peterborough, the following resolution was carried *nem. con.* :—

“That this Conference requests the Bishop of the diocese to take such steps as shall seem best to him for forming a diocesan branch of the Church of England Purity Society.”

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—In the PULPIT for July 26th we were informed by “F. T. P.,” on Dr. Davidson’s authority, of an important fact, to wit, that there is “a large number of words and expressions common to St. Luke and the Pauline Epistles,” a fact that clearly calls for the question by which it is followed in the same letter, “Whence does this similarity arise?” To that question “F. T. P.” gives what seems to be rather a negative than a positive answer, excluding, not without a touch of scorn, one interpretation of the fact as at least improbable. “Orthodoxy,” he wrote, “of course assumes that St. Paul had copies of all his Epistles, the shipwreck notwithstanding, and that St. Luke at Rome had ample leisure inwardly to digest their contents, to gather all the facts of his Gospel and the narrative of his Acts, and to edit them with a Pauline flavour ‘according to my Gospel.’” He proceeds to say, in objection to such supposition, that ecclesiastical tradition about Luke is contradictory and uncertain, and that we are in complete ignorance about him. I observed in reply (September 20th) that those who like me, whether orthodox or not, believed strongly in the “Horæ Paulinæ,” would suppose rather that Luke had scarcely seen the Epistles, and that the coincidence of language came from constant intercourse and constant hearing. At this stage in the controversy “F. T. P.” and I seemed to be, if not approaching agreement, at least narrowing the issue between us. On different grounds we seemed each ready to eliminate the supposition that Luke was a student of the Pauline Epistles. It remained to consider whether the coincidences of language were those of a student of Paul, writing in later times, or of a companion of Paul in constant intercourse with him, and continually hearing his addresses and arguments. On September the 27th, however, “F. T. P.’s” letter contained the following: “It would be strange indeed, after due consideration of the intimacy referred to, and the causes which brought them together at Rome, if we looked on Luke as ignorant of Paul’s Epistles. Of course it suits the argument of the ‘Horæ Paulinæ’ to assume this ignorance, but ‘*Erigena*’ must see on reflection that it is nothing more than an assumption. A man of Paul’s strong religious convictions and persistent energy would more probably be frequently going over with this companion the old ground and the old Epistles in which he had poured forth his whole soul. I cannot imagine a greater solace to St. Paul, aged

and a prisoner. Reticence and silence would not be natural. What documents he had he would exhibit, and the documents nearest to his heart would be his own Epistles. I grant that this is an assumption, but of the two it strikes me as more reasonable than the other."

Now, considering what "F. T. P." said about the uncertainty of tradition about St. Luke, I suppose it is just *possible* that he means in the former passage to explain his own opinion, and in the latter to say what would be likely on the supposition (which he in that case regards as very doubtful) that Luke was with Paul at Rome. Only then he must discard Colossians, Philemon, and 2 Timothy (at the very least this last), the first and last of which one would understand him by implication to accept, while Philemon would in the judgment of most be accepted if Colossians be accepted. If these two passages of "F. T. P.'s" are to be understood in the manner I have suggested, it is open to him to offer this explanation, but even in that case the former passage makes the shipwreck an obstacle to the preservation of Paul's Epistles; the latter passage gets over it without difficulty, describing Paul at Rome as going over the *old* Epistles. Whether his self-contradiction be total or only partial, "F. T. P." alone can tell us. I suspect there has been over haste to refute orthodoxy. So far as it suits the argument of the "*Horæ Paulinæ*" to suppose Luke ignorant of the Epistles, viz., that he wrote the Acts independently of any information in the Epistles, it is so far from being an assumption, that it is, and that is saying a good deal, one of the best established positions in the book. Would any writer who had consulted the two Epistles to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Romans, have thrown the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem, that occupied St. Paul before his last journey thither into one incidental mention in the speech before Felix? see Romans xv. 25-28 and 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4, 2 Cor. viii. and ix. throughout, Acts xxiv. 17. If, according to the modern theory, the book of the Acts had been written at a later date to reconcile, or help the reconciliation of, the Jewish and Pauline parties, or had it been written at any time with help from the Epistles, we can scarcely doubt that the alms and offerings would have assumed much greater importance and appeared in larger proportion to the pathetic farewells and the predictions of bonds and afflictions, which naturally filled so large a place in the mind of an attached companion. Again, compare the account of Paul's escape from Damascus in 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33 with Acts ix. 23-25. In the former we find Aretas the king guarding the city to apprehend Paul, in the latter we find the Jews watching the gates to kill him. There is no contradiction, and the manner of escape is the same in both passages, but each seems to have been written without assistance from the other. But, Sir, it is impossible to reproduce in your columns the remarkable and convincing argument of the "*Horæ Paulinæ*," of which one or two separate samples give but a faint idea. Let those of your readers who desire to reach a just conclusion as to the date of the Gospels, and who are in the enviable position of having the "*Horæ Paulinæ*" still to read, or who have forgotten it, proceed to the study without delay, checking the book with some such work as Archdeacon Farrar's. That the Acts could be written without help from the Epistles, seems to me one of the considerations that count for its early date. A contemporary can work to a great

extent on his own recollection or *memoranda*. In a later generation there is more call to ransack correspondence, and that Paul's Epistles were accessible appears from the Epistles of Clement and Polycarp, if I may assume as probable the genuineness of the latter. At what period in St. Luke's life, whether before or after the death of St. Paul, he wrote the third Gospel, I have offered no opinion, but when it is argued, if it had appeared at the time when Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, he must have mentioned it to Timothy and Titus; it may be asked whether both were not likely enough to know of this Gospel themselves nearly as soon as Paul; and it is, I think, not irrelevant to note that the Acts, so largely devoted to the history of St. Paul, contains no single hint of Epistles which Paul had certainly written before it appeared. But if the Acts does not notice the writings of Paul we are informed by "F. T. P." that Peter does. Now in arguing that Paul *must* in all fair probability have mentioned (in some one of his writings that are now extant) the third Gospel when once it had appeared, this single example could go but a short way; but if "F. T. P." refers to the familiar passage in 2 Peter, it is certainly surprising that one who leans so much to the more destructive criticism, should depend so strongly on the genuineness of about the most disputed book in the whole New Testament, as to make it the one instance of New Testament usage to support his supposition of what Paul must have done. May I not turn the argument and say, be this Epistle ever so genuine, does not the fact that this is the only instance, show that one New Testament writer was unlikely to name the writings of another? Neither Hebrews nor Acts mentions Paul's writings.

Dean Plumptre has, if I recollect accurately, found a good deal to say for the genuineness of 2 Peter, and I daresay he may be right, but to compare the evidence for it with the evidence for the third Gospel would be simply absurd. I can hardly suppose that "F. T. P." means to maintain the genuineness of the epistle, while he denies that of the Gospel. When we are informed that a reference to the third Gospel or the Acts in the pastoral epistles would have changed "for all time the tone of the whole controversy," I can only say that while it may be very true that such a reference would have furnished evidence intrinsically sound, I cannot see how it would have availed against those who impugn the Lucan authorship of the Gospel, seeing that those who impugn the genuineness of this latter, very commonly ("F. T. P." is the only exception I know of) impugn the genuineness of the pastoral epistles. The reference to Luke's writings would probably have been noted by opponents as a fresh proof of the spuriousness of these epistles, and as showing one of the motives for their fabrication.

Similarly an "I Luke" in the preface of the "we sections" would satisfy I fear very few who were not convinced already. Those who doubted or denied the general good faith of the two books might have found several examples of books in the times approaching and following the Christian era containing false professions of authorship, the book of Baruch, IV. Esdras with its "I Salathiel, who am also called Ezra," the Gospel of Thomas or the *Protevangelium* of James (examples which I cull from an author who uses them in another controversy). In fact the arguments that "F. T. P." supposes would have caused such triumph to defenders of the Lucan authorship of the Gospel, might indeed have seemed

satisfactory to the defenders, but I doubt if they would have weighed at all in its favour with any of the more determined opponents. The implied claim of the prefaces and the "we sections" seems far more remote from any suspicion of fraud. To name no author, but to put an "I" into the preface of the Gospel, and to leave such readers as might go on to the preface and to the "we sections" of the Acts to draw the inference would be a far more circuitous device than was at all likely to be used at that period at any rate. But what are the arguments which "F. T. P." calls of "cobweb strength" compared to these two of which he notes the absence? There is first the broad fact of the implied claim of the prefaces compared with the "we sections." I am here called on perhaps to notice the elastic theory that the "we sections" were re-written by some later writer, a theory that would give the great advantage of being able to say at each instance of confirmation of the history "Luke wrote that," at every real or supposed difficulty "there is the later hand." The only evidence as yet offered is the objection to the reference to Jewish festivals by a Gentile Christian. Surely on the face of it there would be no difficulty here in the case of a man who must have associated much and sympathetically with Christian Jews like St. Paul, and may have been originally, as so many probably of the first Christians had been, a semi-proselyte like Cornelius? Could such a man not note that a voyage was begun after the days of unleavened bread, or that sailing was dangerous after "the Fast"? There is more that occurs to me to say, but this seems quite enough.

This theory of re-written "we sections" being contrary to all ordinary presumption of fact ought to stand on very strong evidence indeed. Were the "we sections" re-written in good faith? Then can it be imagined that the writer would leave in the misleading "we," doubly misleading when compared with the preface? Were they re-written fraudulently, and adopted into the Acts in order to pass off it, and perhaps the Gospel, as Luke's? The device seems too circuitous a one for that period, we should surely have had the "I Luke," and as for the Gospel, as far as we can judge from apocryphal literature (at least from any I know of), no forger would have cared to claim Luke as the writer, it would have been "I Pilate" in preference, since Pilate was partly an eye-witness. Were the "we sections" only filled in here and there? Then how account for the numerous coincidences in style with the rest of the book? Were they thoroughly recast? Then how was so delicate a trait of genuineness preserved, as the Pauline complexion of the language in Paul's speech to the elders at Ephesus, contrasted with the Lucan Greek in the report of the speech which Paul delivered in Hebrew? But indeed this theory of re-written "we sections" appears to be almost purely controversial, not critical. "F. T. P." may see in the pamphlet of Dr. Wace's that he has spoken of, how the claim of the "we section" seems to M. Renan to outweigh difficulties as to the Lucan authorship. I detailed in an earlier letter several of the coincidences of style between the "we sections" and the rest of the Lucan writings (see my letter of May the 10th).

To proceed, there is the confirmation of the "we sections" in the work of Mr. Smith, of Jordanhill, "Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul." There is the great argument of Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ." There

is the argument from medical language, compared with "Luke, the beloved physician," in Colossians. There is the late Professor Birks's argument by elimination (which I quoted May 24th, making one or two exceptions from it), that of those mentioned in the Epistles of the first imprisonment at Rome only Luke could have written the Acts; there are the coincidences between 1 Corinthians xi. and xv. (in the account of the Last Supper and the "first seen of Cephas") with the third Gospel; there are the coincidences that "F. T. P." has told us of between the language of Luke and the Pauline Epistles (I don't think any reader of the "Horæ Paulinæ" will suppose that the writer of the Acts had studied these Epistles so diligently as to seriously influence his style of writing); there is the resemblance of style that struck ancient critics between Luke and the semi-Pauline or Pauline Epistle to the Hebrews, and it claims to be written by a contemporary and companion of Timothy.

Do not these three facts at least agree with the belief that the writer of the third Gospel and Acts was a companion and follower of Paul? There is the use of Luke's Gospel within the Church by Justin Martyr about the middle of the second century; and on one side of the Church the use of a mutilated copy of it by the ultra-Pauline Docetist Marcion (whom Mr. Savage tells of as taking the Hebraic side in the controversy, and as describing Christ as human!) and on the other side of the Church, somewhere, it is supposed, about the same period, the use of Luke by the Ebionites as shown in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies; and outside the pale of Christian belief altogether there is reference to it (I believe it is admitted) by the Celsus (c. 178 A.D.) whom Origen answered. I ask, would the Pauline Gospel have been readily adopted by Paul-hating Ebionites, or could such widespread recognition have grown up in any short period? Yet again there are the signs partly in Justin Martyr, more evidently in Marcion, of corruptions of the text of a "Western" character. Trace back from Marcion's date, about 140 A.D., to the divergence of Alexandrine and "Western" manuscripts, and from that to the first appearance of the Gospel, remembering the slow multiplication of Uncial MSS., and you come very near the traditional date by at least highly probable inference. I remember an amusing paper, "Divisions of a Pedagogue," which mentioned that the translation, "Cæsar marched during the night twenty millions of miles," was received by a whole class with perfect gravity. The boys, if they noted the meaning at all, had perhaps not realised that Cæsar was a being subject to human limitations in his action. I think we shall do well to take care that we make no similar mistake in slurring over such important processes as the coming of a Gospel into general recognition, or the springing up of a family of MSS. There is, lastly, the thoroughly established position of all four Gospels that we find so clearly proved to have existed at the end of the Second Century in such distant quarters of the Roman world.

ERIGENA.

Your reviewer on Dr. Hobart's "Medical Language" must not suppose that the above was written as ignoring his arguments. This letter had gone in a week ago, and I now (November 17th) add this postscript on the proof sheet.

SELF-PRESERVATION.

SIR,—Your readers may thank you for reprinting a sermon in your last issue of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT on "Self-Preservation;" but let me deprecate a custom too common amongst the clergy of "improving the occasion" in matters which are *sub judice*, or not admitting of time being allowed to pass by to allow of all the facts being thoroughly ventilated. The clergy might copy with advantage the caution of the British Press, and the care taken not to injure feeling by prematurely printed opinions. In the sad case of the "Mignonette," I venture to think that the Curate of St. Gabriel's might have read with advantage the account of the trial and remarks of the judge, Baron Huddleston. "The curse of Cain will cleave to them," are words which would hardly be uttered by one of our English Judges. I believe such words, if they came from the Bench, would not be deemed wise, under the peculiarly trying circumstances which invested that case; but, coming from a pulpit, they ought not to be received without protest. The cases of self-sacrifice to which the curate alludes, are entirely different to the painful case with which the sermon starts. I do not think any good end is to be gained by arguing this out; those who know anything of such dire distress, or of the Indian Mutiny, will not indorse the curate's one-sided *ipse dixit*. In another part of his sermon, the preacher says, "I do not know that our Lord, either by what He said or did, ever gave us cause to think that self-preservation was to be the law of His Kingdom." The preacher will find here that in our Lord's teaching, circumstances were to alter cases. He commanded those who believed His prophecy to "flee to the mountains" when Jerusalem was besieged. This was advising self-preservation. A blind admission of the doctrine of self-sacrifice would say, these persons deserted their country's cause, and left relatives and defenders to take care of themselves. It is unfortunate that the sentence I quote above should end with the words, "That a Christian's leading thought should be to save his own soul." The subject-matter of the sermon is self-devotion in sacrificing life to save life. Our Lord says, "Whosoever shall lose his life for My sake shall find it. For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life." (Revised Version).

I suppose we may all rest content to be judged by a perfect Judge, as to what is rightly saving our life or rightly self-sacrificing it; but, as to the verdict of this preacher, we may say, "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged." At any rate, in such a case as that referred to at the commencement of the sermon on self-preservation, after reading the curate's sentence, I fancy most men will say, "Let us fall now into the hands of the Lord, for His mercies are great, and let us not fall into the hand of man."

If the question is asked, "Are the clergy of a church so favoured in many ways which aid in her preachers becoming exponents and guides of public opinion, to be silent on the difficult point with which the sermon on Self-preservation commences?" The answer would probably be, on topics of extraordinary difficulty, where legal questions are involved, the views of barristers might be obtained, which would be given gratis, and willingly, to prevent any preacher appearing as an unjust judge. In such an unusual case as the painful one alluded to, if experts were consulted—that is, old sailors who had known "perils by sea, and been in

dangers oft"—their advice may be guessed:—"Let any of you gentlemen moor a big boat a quarter of a mile from Brighton Pier, about Equinoctial gale time, remain in it for three days and three nights, with only a hard biscuit and a cup of water, and then tell his experiences with the clearest head and best heart he can bring ashore with him."

A. D. P.

THE Universities Settlement Association sent down a deputation, which addressed a large meeting in the hall of Trinity College, Cambridge, on Friday night, The Vice-Master took the chair, and after a short introduction, called on Mr. Barnett, of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, to speak as to the objects of the settlement, and the progress made with the building of Toynbee Hall. His speech was not calculated to awaken much enthusiasm: there was a more hearty ring about the Hon. Alfred Littleton's remarks on the dreariness of London life to young professional men, and the advantages of such occupation as they will find in the settlement. Mr. Rogers, a Whitechapel bookbinder, also spoke exceedingly well from actual experience, of the good done by the somewhat desultory efforts that have been already made in this direction.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Austen, Rev. Samuel Cooper, M.A., Vicar of Kniveton, Derbyshire.
 Bates, Rev. William, Vicar of Codnor-with-Loscoe, Derbyshire.
 Browne, Rev. D. G. Lathom, Chaplain in Rangoon.
 Venn-Childe, Rev. Christopher, Vicar of St. Mary, Kilburn; Vicar of Christ Church, Cheltenham.
 Cree, Rev. John Adams, B.D., Vicar of Sunningdale, Berks.
 Du Port, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Mattishall; Rector of Denver.
 Elton, Rev. William, M.A., Lecturer of Bolton Parish Church; Vicar of St. Paul's, Burnley.
 Greenwood, Rev. George, British Chaplain in Egypt.
 Jones, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, Walton, Warrington; Rector of Winlaton, in the Diocese of Durham.
 Keith, Rev. Charles M., Rector of Weston-in-Gordano, Somerset.
 Loyd, Rev. L. H., Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Northampton; Vicar of Wing, near Leighton Buzzard.
 Rivers, Rev. Arthur Richard, M.A., late Curate of Painswick, Gloucestershire; Precentor of Sydney, and Chaplain to the Primate of Australia.
 Roberts, Rev. Harry, Rector of West Wickham, Kent.
 Seymour, Rev. Lord Victor Alexander, Vicar of Carshalton, Surrey.
 Smith, Rev. J. Finch, M.A., Rector of Aldridge, and late Rural Dean of Walsall; Prebendary of Lichfield.
 Snowdon, Rev. James, Head Master of the Grammar School, and Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Richmond, Yorkshire; Vicar of Sunninghill.
 Strange, Rev. Cresswell, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Southampton; Vicar of Edgbaston.
 Strawbridge, Rev. William A., Curate of Doncaster; Vicar of Masbrough, near Rotherham.
 Terry, Rev. Thomas Robert, M.A., Rector of East Ilsley, Berks.
 West, Rev. John Rowland, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln.
 Williams, Rev. Arthur Anderson, M.A., Vicar of Colton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Almack, Rev. Henry, D.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and for upwards of thirty-eight years Rector Fawley, at Fawley, Rectory, Henley-on-Thames, on the 17th inst., aged 78.
 Borton, Rev. Charles, late Rector of Hartest-cum-Boxted and sometime Vicar of Wickhambrook, Suffolk, at Bury St. Edmund's, on the 11th inst., aged 83.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHRISTIAN OPPORTUNITY.

BY THE REV. J. E. C. WELLDON, MASTER OF
DULWICH COLLEGE.

SERMON PREACHED IN RUGBY SCHOOL
CHAPEL, OCTOBER 19, 1884.

"They go from strength to strength, every one of them in
Zion appeareth before God."—PSALM lxxxiv. 7.

THIS is the law of the divine life. Human life is ever passing from strength to weakness. It is with glad and lightsome steps that the young man climbs, as you perchance are climbing now, the hill of life, until from the brow of it he looks down upon an almost boundless field of hopes and possibilities; and then, from that very moment, he begins sadly, wearily, painfully, falteringly, to descend. But he who trusts in God and walks in the light of His love, is treading a path which rises, rises evermore until, far away above the earth, it hides itself in the utter brightness and beatitude of heaven. It is the path which angels tread, ascending and descending, as they minister to the needs of humankind. It begins in awe and issues in adoration. There is no descent, no decline in the spiritual life. Faith leaves not its first love or its first beauty. The oldest Christian is ever the Christian nearest Christ. He gathers strength, as his physical powers and energies wane. The chamber of death is the marriage-chamber of the redeemed. To depart hence is their ambition, to be with God the consummation of their desires. Perhaps they are sufferers, but it is suffering which makes them perfect. What the world counts loss and sorrow is their gain. And as the years pass, and earth's shadows fold around them, new lights from heaven are ever breaking upon their souls; they are conscious of truer and holier lessons in Nature and Providence than they had ever known or thought to know before, they are drawing nearer to the beatific vision, they are catching glimpses, few and far but ever clearer, of the city that has no need of sun or moon, "for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." It is true of them, in the beautiful language of the poet, that,

The soul's dark cottage battered and decayed
Lets in new light through chinks that time has made:
Stronger by weakness, wiser men become
As they draw near to their eternal home."

I do not know if the truth I set forth in these words finds an echo in the young experience of your hearts. Youth has learnt so little of life's deep

Vol. XVIII.—No. 466.

realities that it scarce perceives its own necessity of religion. And yet I would help you a little to-day, if God so will. It is to me a privilege passing words to stand in this pulpit, to speak to you, the custodians of the high traditions which cling to the walls of this illustrious foundation. I cannot tell what are your special needs and difficulties. I speak to you once only in a lifetime, I shall never speak again to this same audience in this same place. But I know you have much need of religious faith. You find it hard now, I do not doubt, to do your duty. It will be harder, greatly harder, in the days to be. You will have a larger liberty, which soon degenerates into licence. You will have new temptations, which will come upon you as a flood. Perhaps your conscience will have lost its delicate sensitiveness. You will need ever and again a hand to stay you when you are falling, a kindly voice to calm and still your boding heart. What shall aid you, what shall comfort you, but religion? It is faith which removes mountains. It is love—the love of God and man—which hallows human life. To know that there is a Friend who cares for you, when all is against you, to lift your eyes to Him in sorrow and temptation, yes, and to feel the horror of the sin which crucifies Him afresh, to shrink from it that you may not desecrate His person, that you may not grieve the tender charity of His heart—this is the power of religion in a troubled world, and you will have much cause to stay yourselves upon it, if you are to live as the saints of God lived in olden days, if you are to show the image of Christ to a weary age which has half forgotten the inspiration of His divinity.

Suffer me then, as I would lead you on "from strength to strength," to show you the greatness of the opportunity which lies before you. Yet a brief while, and you will go forth into the world, you will be face to face with the problems of the day. In political life, in social life, in morals, in religion itself, you will be called to choose a part; and the choice you make will be influential upon human history. What shall be the issue of the nineteenth century in which you live, nay, of the twentieth century (for it, too, you may hope to see), whether it shall show in the after-days as an age of broken hopes, and faint beliefs and aspirations, born to die a deeper death; or rather as a regenerating era of Humanity, like the first century, or the thirteenth, or the sixteenth, will depend in some measure upon all that you and others who share your responsibility think and do. Have faith, then, faith in God, faith in yourselves. Do not fall into the cheap and common error of those who seek to justify their own degeneracy by blaming the age in which their lot is cast. Do not say the world has lost its primal lustre. Do not imagine that heroism departed from war with the invention of gunpowder, or poetry from life with the manufacture of the steam-engine, or the sense

of present responsibility from conduct with the theory of evolutionary development. Do not imagine it is too late an age for saintship, as though the God in whom you live and have your being had been nearer to earth of yore than He is now. Why should you be casting your wistful eyes for ever backwards to some far fancied golden age long, long ago? why be thinking that, if you had lived then, in other days, when the world was young, beneath another sky, so could you have "scorned delights and lived laborious days," so and so only had it been easy to live the Christ-like life upon the earth? Oh! believe me, not in the past, but in the future—the future which is yours—lies the golden age of the Church. You have no need to cross the ocean to be missionaries, to found a new Rugby in a far-off land, that those qualities which made this School what now it is may reassert themselves. The word of God is very nigh you, you have the poor with you always, you can minister to Christ in ministering to His brethren. Look around you, and see if ever, since the world was, there has been an age when the problems of thought and action which offered themselves to men were more deserving the devotion of the highest intellects—ever an age when there was more need of learning, or disciplined temper, or the spirituality which is the light of human life.

For there must be some of you who are preparing for political life. You aspire by serving the people to be their rulers. You are ambitious of great place. You would be much and often in the mouths of men. You would win the crown of thorns that binds a statesman's brow. It is well, or it may be well. But in what spirit will you enter upon politics? Shall it seem to you all a game, in which you play for higher stakes than in other games, and will you be ready now and again at the bidding of interest to disobey the still small voice which speaks within you, doing the evil which is certain in the hope that the good which is only contingent may come after? or will you set conscience above success and live "as ever in your great Taskmaster's eye," and gladly bear, if He so will, the reproaches of those in the service of whom you have spent yourselves and all that is yours? Look at the tone and temper of political life. There was a dignity and decency in politics once; where is it now? Is the language of rival politicians which you read in the newspapers such as befits the senators of a worldwide empire? Where is the scrupulous love of truth, the responsibility which is the seal of sober statesmanship, the respect, the generosity due—I will not say to any chance opponent, but at least to one who has grown old in the service of the State? Or look at the changing conditions of public life. The balance of power is shifting. The future rests with the many, not with the few. Conservatism itself has become democratical. The Church as

well as the State is paying homage to the masses. The question is, how will the masses use their power? It is high time, we have been told, to educate our rulers. What will *you* say to them, when you stand on public platforms? will you set before them no ideal of Christian duty? will you seek only to gain their votes by pandering to their selfishness and secularity, by promising that your political party will do the most for the material comfort of their worldly lives? or will you remember that "there is a nobler ambition than the gaining of all California would be, or the getting of all the suffrages that are on the planet just now?" will you lift them to higher thoughts and purer motives? will you teach them the trinity of Christian virtues,

Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control?

will you endow them with the noblest of all franchises, even the liberty with which Christ makes His people free?

But I pass to the social problem, which is exercising the minds and hearts of thoughtful men; and here again I would show you the need and the opportunity of Christian faith, Christian duty, Christian love. For you are living amidst a strife of rival classes. There are strange forces (which as yet one can hardly estimate) working below the even surface of society. The antagonism of rich and poor is growing keener. The remarkable book which has shot like wildfire through the land proves, if nothing else, at least that civilisation, which modern thought is apt to worship as a goddess, does not mitigate but in some sense even intensifies the social difference which parts one section of the community from another. The rich are richer, it is true; but the poor are not less poor. Only they feel their poverty more, their degradation. The carriage-wheels of the great which splash their tattered garments awake a bitter indignation in their hearts. Why should Nature be so partial in her beneficence? why should the many toil and suffer that the few may dwell at ease? and there are angry voices, you know, on every side, telling them that the world has long been out of joint, showing them fair delusive hopes of wealth and happiness, bidding them strike a blow for liberty and be free. Brethren, how shall you calm the seething human waters? how shall you make men feel that they are brothers again? Not by reforming your laws, but by reforming yourselves. It is by a new and pure conception of the duty which belongs of right to property and social privilege, by the charity which is never condescension, by the love which counts its joy to spend its lifeblood, if so only it may save one soul of those for whom the Lord in His dear mercy deigned to die. Oh! believe me, it is not to legislation only that he must look who would save society from dislocation. It is to the royal commission of philanthropy. It is to the gospel of

self-sacrifice preached not in words only, but by life, and, if need be, by death. It is to the charity of an Edward Denison, a Frederick Maurice, a Sister Dora, an Octavia Hill. It is to the missions, whether evangelical or only secular and humane, in which the Universities—to their credit be it spoken—are not refusing to learn a lesson from the Public Schools. But the sum of all I say, or try to say, is, that now as ever, nay, more than ever, the State has need of the Church, and that it will be for you and others like you in coming days, which even now, as I speak, are casting their shadows before, to regenerate and illumine human society by the inspiration which flows, like sunlight, from the heaven.

Yet again, there await you, my brethren, moral questions which will sorely tax and try the energy of your souls. Do not doubt that the evolution of morality will continue, that God has ever higher and nobler lessons to teach to each successive generation of mankind. Did you ever watch the awakening of the national conscience in some neglected region of the moral law? It is an individual first who is startled to the realisation of an evil which everybody has taken until then to be a thing of course; he is ridiculed perhaps, upbraided, persecuted; it has often happened that he dies a martyr's death; yet the truth he taught is fertile in the after-time, the heart of the people is touched at last and stirred to sympathy, and public sentiment swells and surges, as a wave, until it has swept away the sin of thought or life. It was so in the emancipation of the slave; let the names of Clarkson and Wilberforce be my witnesses. It has been so in the crusade which before our eyes has been waged so gallantly and victoriously against intemperance. It will be so, I cannot doubt, in the greater crusade in which men shall spend and be spent with willing sacrifice ere the sands of this nineteenth century have run out. For they who have borne the stress and burden of the battle against the drink that has ruined the homes of English people as a pestilence, are well aware that scarce one half the work is done when men and women have been saved, though as by fire, from the slavery of intoxicating liquors. There is another evil which eats into the heart of civilisation. I dare not speak of it more particularly in this place; there are things of which it is a shame even to speak. But oh! the story of Andromeda repeats itself; the beauty, the grace of womanhood is to be rescued from a worse enemy than the dragon of the deep. Will you not give yourselves in the flower of your days to this high duty? Will you not resolve, now ere life's shadows fold about you, ere your conscience has lost aught of its delicacy, or your spirit of its chivalry, or your soul of its deep and intimate communion with Him, who

shall it not be your high deliberate resolution that never by overt action or most secret thought, never, though all the world shall be against you, will you do anything that shall violate the sanctity of a life which but for you perhaps had been holy and undefiled?

But it is in my heart to speak to you also of religious belief; for it is here perhaps that what is called the spirit of the age will most affect you. So long as you are at Rugby there will be a uniformity in your lives; you will rise together in the morning, will do the same or similar lessons in the same hours, and will participate in the same religious exercises, listening side by side to the same solemn prayers, kneeling together, perhaps, at the same holy table. Nay, it may well be that, as you worship within these walls the memory of the good and great who have worshipped here before you may in some sense, although you know it not, mould and chasten and sanctify your lives, so that you would not be happy without the discipline of religion. But it will not be so always. You will be withdrawn from these local influences and associations. You will face religious difficulties; perhaps—I know not—you will be called to face them alone. You will find a good deal that you hold most dear falling away almost imperceptibly from your grasp; you will have the dreadful sense of insecurity in religious things. You will be tempted to think that faith is harder than once it was. You will despair almost of attaining to the truth, when you see the good and the wise differing so widely in the view they take of it, and some of your friends disdaining the quest of it altogether.

I do not think I can put the case more strongly than thus, and I am telling you the intimate experience of my life. And having so stated it, may I offer you just three thoughts as being helpful in the difficult way in religious duty?

The first is this, Do not deny or ignore the value of religion. It may be hard to attain religious belief, or to preserve it when it has been attained. But it is the one thing needful. It is the fact which differentiates man from man, nation from nation, century from century. The ages of Faith have been the strong ages. Culture, art, science, philosophy, these are well, but the sum of human life is not in these. Whether there is a God and in what relation He is pleased to stand to the children of men, whether this present world is everything, and all of moment or opportunity that man can have is bounded by the limit of an earthly grave; or, on the other hand, the life we live is but a discipline for the mysterious awful world which lies behind the veil, what is sin, what is the sanction of morality, what is the answer to the spiritual hopes and aspirations which are such infeasible elements of human nature—these are the questions which it is most natural to man to ask, these are the facts which it most concerns him to know.

For His cradle and His throne
Chooseth the pure in heart;

And as the knowledge of them is his chief concern on earth, so I would say, secondly, Do not despair of religious truth. I know no worse sign of the time in which we live than the calm complacency with which not a few thoughtful men turn their backs on the field of religious speculation, as though in it there were no harvest to be reaped, no knowledge that could ever be attained. Is not this hopelessness well nigh traitorous to Humanity? Who shall set a bound to man's possibilities? Who shall bar him from his inheritance? Who shall deny him his high privilege of communion with the Divine Spirit? Brethren, if it were true—God knows I do not at all allow it to be the truth—that nothing had as yet been learnt in all the ages respecting His high attributes of power and love, had the spiritual experiences and emotions of the wise and good been nothing worth, had Man breathed his prayers for ever to the listless thankless air, had there been no echo of his cries from out eternity, no hand that stayed him in the whelming bitter waters, no voice that whispered peace and happiness and love—still, still, methinks, if this were so, it were his wisdom to spend the dearest energies of his life, the most precious enthusiasms of his spirit in the search for this inestimable truth. But if religion is an experimental science, if God has spoken ever and again to human souls, if you too may have, as the saints have had, the witness of the faith in yourselves, then what a revenue of spirituality shall be yours who humbly, frankly, patiently, reverently seek to understand and to fulfil His holy will.

Only—and this is my third thought—Do not think the truth which is of such high moment can be learnt without an effort. It is the common error of the day to have assumed that one man's opinion is as good as another's about religion. There is nothing in the world, I venture to think, so false as this. It is the disciplined mind alone that judges of art and science. You would scorn as a sciolist one who should criticise secular learning without any preparatory training. Has religion then less need of its own discipline? Shall the pearl of price be won by the first comer? If I leave no other lesson with you, my brethren, let me leave this, that he who would enter into the mystery of religion, who would know what God is and how He deals with human souls, he must discipline himself by prayer and earnest study, by the energy of good works, by communion with sorrow and suffering in the world, by confession and self-consecration, by the charity which hopes all things of mankind, by the purity which exalts the heart to heaven.

But if you do this, you have a boundless prospect of religion. God has not yet spoken His last word of revelation. The Holy Spirit, who is ever with us, is teaching us all things, and guiding us by slow degrees to perfect truth. Every ele-

vation of human thought and human desire, every effort of sympathy with human good, every true and pure conception of the Divine love which watches over men, every enlargement of Christian tolerance, every illumination of the Christian conscience, is a progress to the coming of that day when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Brethren, such is the ideal I set before you, and such the preparation it demands. I do not say it is easy of realisation, but I say it is infinitely blessed. It shall cheer you in the dark days of life. It shall lift your hearts from earth to very heaven. It shall gain for you, if you are faithful to it, the welcome of Him whose smile is a recompense for all earthly troubles. It shall guide you "from strength to strength," until in Zion you appear before God.

SPIRITUAL WORSHIP.

SERMON PREACHED IN SHANKILL PARISH CHURCH, LURGAN, ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1884, ON THE OCCASION OF THE RE-OPENING OF THE CHURCH AFTER REPAIRS.

BY THE REV. T. CAMPBELL, D.D., THE RECTOR, CHAPLAIN TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND.

"God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth."—JOHN iv. 24.

TO our Lord's interview with the woman of Samaria we owe the clear and unmistakable announcement of God's nature, and of the worship that is consonant with that nature. If we would understand the full bearing of that announcement, we must thoroughly grasp and keep before our mind at least the leading circumstances under which it was made. Our Lord, wearied with His journey, by His weariness revealing His very humanity, that He was bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, encompassed with all our infirmities, sat on Jacob's well to rest. A woman of Samaria came at the same time to draw water for her household. A poor woman; a woman, too, whose character was not of the very best, and whose character was well known in the divine wisdom of the Lord. "Jesus saith to her, Give Me to drink." Simple as appears the request, there was, under all the circumstances, the grand intimation made, that there and then the distinctions of nations and of race had passed away, that God is the God alike of the Gentile, and of the Jew; and Jesus the Saviour of all. The woman, in utter astonishment, replies, How canst Thou, who art a Jew, (implying, with all thy pride of sex, as great as thy pride of nation,) ask drink of me who am a woman, and a Samaritan woman too? The Lord at once proceeds to discharge His office as a Teacher come from God. As only a short time

before He had instructed "the master in Israel," so now does He teach this woman. The subject of His instruction to both was the same, and that the Spiritual Life. The natural emblems under which He presented it are different. In the case of Nicodemus it was birth, and birth and life are ever connected; in the case of the woman it was springing or living water; the emblems were suitable to the circumstances of each, and alike taught the same spiritual truth. In the words of the title of a well-known book, "*Natural Law in the Spiritual World*"; in each of these emblems the law of nature is the law of the spiritual life, life is to man by birth, and water rises to its level. So to Nicodemus it was taught, "Except a man be born from above—be born of the Spirit—that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit"; and to the woman, it was, "Living water—a well of water springing up into everlasting life." Now, contrast these two to whom this teaching was given. One, a man, a Jew, wise, learned, rich, moral; the other, a woman, a Samaritan, ignorant, narrow-minded, poor, immoral; yet each alike unable to comprehend the spiritual truth thus revealed. Two more remarkable illustrations than these contrasts afford could not be given of the Apostle's statement, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. ii. 14). The Jewish teacher's thoughts could not rise above nature's birth; nor the Samaritan woman's above the water in the well.

Spiritual life leads on to spiritual worship. With the view to convince the woman that He was competent to instruct, He introduces her private history. He shows her that He was fully acquainted with it. That a stranger, a Jew, whose name was unknown to her, and her's to him, with whom there could not have been any social dealings, should know so intimately her private life, at once impresses her with the conviction that He was a divinely taught and commissioned prophet; and now she would have the long-disputed point of worship contested between the Jews and her people decided. She states the controversy fully and tersely. The Samaritans had erected a temple on Mount Gerizim (which had been at that time for some years destroyed), and they had imitated the religion of Israel, and adopted the Jewish hope of a coming Messiah. And they contended that on that mountain God should be worshipped, and there only. The Jews, on the contrary, maintained that to the temple in Jerusalem ought men to come to worship God. She waited for an answer that would settle the vexed question for ever. The answer came, but; oh, how different from what she could possibly have expected! The Lord knew the difficulty that existed, and still exists, in the human mind to receive the truth He was about to utter. He therefore begs her, in the striking

words, "Woman, believe Me," to lay aside her preconceived opinions, her prejudices, her natural astonishment at what He was about to say, and meekly to receive from Him, whom she had acknowledged to be a Prophet, the startling announcement that the time not only was coming, but had actually arrived, when place, whether Gerizim or Jerusalem, or elsewhere, should form no necessary accompaniment of God's worship. He is God not only of the Jews or Samaritans, but of all the Gentiles, of all families upon the face of the earth, and that from among all, wherever they might dwell, He would seek His true worshippers, whom He describes as worshipping Him in Spirit and truth. His teaching is twofold. 1. Negative. No place is essential for His worship. 2. Affirmative. His worship is in Spirit and truth. Not the gorgeous temple, though built after God's own model; not the splendid cathedral, nor the simple church; the mountain's top, nor the valley's hollow, the open canopy of heaven alone over the heads of the worshippers—none, none of these is *the* temple where alone God can be worshipped. There is one, and one only temple where He has placed His throne, where alone He will receive the homage of men; and that is the heart of the man wherein has been born the spiritual life of God Himself. For "God is Spirit;" this is His nature, His essence, "incomprehensible," "within no walls confined." Hence no worship can be consonant with His nature, save the worship "in Spirit and truth"—the worship that naturally, truly, upwards tends to Him from spiritual life within. Nor was this truth revealed at Jacob's well for the first time. Solomon uttered it in his prayer at the dedication of his temple: "Will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, the heaven, and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee; how much less the house that I have builded?" This was the keynote of Stephen's impassioned address: "Solomon built him an house. Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands: as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne and earth my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord; or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things?" And so St. Paul at Athens: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed any thing, seeing He giveth to all life and breath and all things." And yet from the days of this interview with the woman, nay indeed, from the days of Solomon, men need to hear the expostulation of the Lord addressed to them, "believe Me"; so prone is our fallen humanity to place the true worship of God in splendid fanes, decorated churches, elaborate ritual, and sensuous music, things that can appeal only to, and excite the sensuous nature of man, and rouse within him natural feelings, which if they do not

depress the spiritual life within, can certainly not arouse and raise it up to God. The worship of Almighty God is the worship of their heavenly Father by His children, born from above of His own spiritual life, and that life with all its spiritual and heavenly aspirations ever welling up to Him its level and its source. This is God's spiritual and acceptable worship.

Now while these things are so, let me remind you, brethren, that there is "a fitness in things," and that this fitness does not sanction neglect and dirt. In "the sanctity of dirt" I have no faith; and it does certainly become Christian worshippers to see that their houses, where they assemble to offer up their united worship, are becoming the service for which they are erected; to have them as beautiful as without excess they can be, as neat, and clean, and free from every symptom of neglect as a common sense of propriety dictates. Shall I say that it augurs ill for a man's piety if he spend much on his own dwelling-house, and care little for, and neglect the house of God? It was the reproach of the Lord by Haggai, the Prophet, "Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your cieled houses, and this house waste?" (i. 4.) And too long has this our parish church been left even unpainted, more than twenty years since its erection; and consequently deterioration of the edifice, and danger from falling masses of mortar from the roof. It is to the credit of one of our present churchwardens that this state of things no longer exists. You see with your own eyes what has been done, the expenses are heavy, but for many years to come no such are likely to be incurred.

Let me, in closing, direct your thoughts for a moment to the text (1 Cor. xi. 26) which surmounts the Communion-table. Is it not suggestive? It binds the past with the future, the death with the glory, the first advent of our Lord with His second. "'Till He come"! Oft as your eyes rest on the words, they will renew in your faith the crowning act in the history of the world's redemption. We sang to-day the hymn which begins and ends with these words. May I ask you to ponder every verse in that hymn? And oft as ye kneel at the supper of the Lord in memory of His death, the aspirations of your pious hearts will be, Oh, that ere long we may see Him face to face, when He will come bringing with Him the salvation purchased with His precious blood, and that is "ready to be revealed in the last time." And will not, then, these three words, as ye dwell on them, almost force from your longing, loving hearts the cry, "Come, Lord Jesus, quickly! Amen"?

See the feast of love is spread,
Drink the wine, and eat the bread;
Sweet memorials—'till the Lord
Calls us round His heavenly board;
Some from earth, from glory some,
Severed only, "'till He come."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1884.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S CHARGE.—II.

WE have shown already that the bishop's effort throughout his charge is to treat the wafer-worship, which is being introduced into churches in his diocese, with his connivance, if not with his express sanction, as a mere external, and therefore unimportant, thing. He says, with obvious reference to this fashionable idolatry:—

We may be well content to leave without rebuke ritual we could not use ourselves, and modes of teaching and enforcing God's truth which we do not deem the best, so long as we see them telling effectually on sin and unbelief, and winning souls into the Church's fold. What matters it, if the war is waged successfully, that the weapons are not of exactly the same pattern and temper as our own?

And again:—

Our differences of ritual, of Church policy, and of our ways of approaching and exhibiting divine truth shrink into very small proportions.

To the bishop the exhibition of a material object for worship is "a mode or way of teaching and enforcing, of approaching and exhibiting, God's truth." An idolatrous ritual is not the one that he deems best, but one that should be left without episcopal rebuke, "so long as it seems to tell effectually on sin and unbelief." If so, let us be consistent, let us abrogate the second commandment, and make no more mention of the jealous God. We now turn to the more external matters dealt with in his lordship's charge. We will treat only such as are not merely diocesan, but relating to the Church at large. He sketches the history of the Public Worship Regulation Act; and he traces its present failure, very accurately, to the accidental circumstance that the only mode of enforcing the judge's decisions was found to be the imprisonment of the contumacious clerk. He

might have added, as a contributing cause of failure, the absurd provision, introduced under sacerdotalist influence, that deprivation should not ensue till the expiration of three years' contumacy. Through the operation of the first of these causes, he represents, with some gratification, that the Act, so far as regards its action on ritual, is crippled, if not dead. He has reason for the first, but not for the second of these two epithets. If the penalty of imprisonment were removed, the period for deprivation fixed at three months instead of three years, and, above all, the bishop's veto abolished, the Act would be found to have recovered all its vitality. On the matter of the Ecclesiastical Courts, the bishop goes entirely with the commissioners. He defends the episcopal veto on the usual grounds that by it frivolous charges are stopped, and zealous strangers or paid informers prevented from disturbing the peace of congregations. But he does not allude, except under the mild word of "prejudice," to the unfortunate fact that any bishop may be, and that many of the bishops are, thorough-going partisans, and, in relation to the prominent superstition of the present day, votaries of that idolatry, which it is their duty to suppress. He approves the Court of Appeal according to the project of the Commissioners, and has sufficient common sense to see that the legal mind is better fitted than the clerical for dealing with the interpretation of phraseology. Taken altogether, the charge is a feeble one, written apparently with a view of producing temporary harmony. Such can only be an armistice, not a peace. For the question whether our churches are or are not to be devoted again to gross idolatry, presses for decision, and cannot be evaded.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

OVERCROWDED DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

SIR,—It is with great pleasure I see your excellent paper give such prominence to the connection of sanitation with religion, for I (with many others) hold that the religion of a man in bad health is mostly inferior to that of a man in good health and with good sanitary surroundings, and it is for this reason so many men of my profession hail this sanitary-religious movement with satisfaction.

In this week's issue I notice a letter and a sermon by the Rev. George Bladon, both of which I was pleased to see.

It is not for me to say anything on the sermon, but I should like to notice the letter briefly.

In it Mr. Bladon (if I do not misunderstand his meaning) brings forward the question—Is it advisable to use means for the prevention of large families?

I am neither "radical," "atheist," nor "pseudo-scientist," but a member of the Church of England

and a strong Conservative, but I certainly incline to think Mr. Bladon's letter gives the correct cause of the present state of our people, and have thought so for some time. However, I keep an open mind on the subject, and am willing to be convinced by good reasons either way.

I have had great experience (comparatively) of our poorest classes both in London and in the country, and in all cases the fact is thrust upon me that were there not such large families, the people would be cleaner, healthier, happier, and better.

The reasons I tend to hold such views are: (1) As things are at present there is, as many men know, an immense amount of "veiled infanticide." The statistics of our infantile mortality alone show that. (2) As is pointed out, people who could live happily and comfortably with a small family in a four-roomed cottage, with a large family are compelled to be in a state of semi-starvation, overcrowding, "mixing of the sexes," and of social, moral, and physical filthiness. Even in the middle classes it is not unlike, where there is a large family and small means. (3) Then to consider not the least of the evils, it is notorious that most women who have had a large family are, as they say, "worn out" with the family, the illnesses such women are especially liable to, and with the cares of the house, etc.

As to the prevention being "unnatural," I would only say that as "civilised" people we cannot live naturally, and *must* be artificial; for instance, we cut our hair, wear clothes and boots, work by night instead of by day, etc., etc.

With regard to your remarks, Sir, there is no doubt whatever but that the country is over-populated, whether the dwellings of the poor show it or not, and even if emigration were assisted to an enormous extent, I doubt if that would be a success, as many of our colonies, *e.g.*, New Zealand and Tasmania, are not by any means anxious for emigrants. Then—Is prevention better than cure or not?

The only objection I see which is a grave one, is the possible increase in immorality. This, however, could be met by inculcating principles of purity from childhood up, as suggested by the C. E. P. S. And I should think it wiser only to "speak plainly" to those married or about to marry.

I concur entirely with Mr. Bladon as to the reform needed in the Marriage Service.

Trusting I am not trespassing too much on your valuable space,

A. E. L. CHARPENTIER, M.B.

Uxbridge, November 18th, 1884.

SIR,—I have just seen your issue of the 15th inst., and cannot refrain from writing to you to express my intense satisfaction on reading the letter of the Rev. George Bladon on "Overcrowded Dwellings of the Poor." With unfeigned joy do I see a clergyman of the Church of England thus come forward to lay his finger on the root of the evil, and with all boldness to proclaim his dissent from the current cant with which a most pernicious social code is being buttressed up in the name of religion and morality. A day of hope is dawning, a door of possible salvation is being opened if true and noble men and women will indeed face this question, and will speak out plainly, stripping it bare, and presenting in its true character of selfishness, cruelty, and immorality, that course of conduct by which people bring into the world any number of children, utterly regardless of

all consideration as to how they are to be fed, clothed, educated, and started in life.

The law of population is not less a law of God than is the law of gravitation, and in the one case no less than in the other will Nature exact her penalties from those who close their eyes and live in defiance of it. How any one visiting the homes of the poor can possibly speak in such connection of "the beneficent processes of Nature," witnessing as he must the huge amount of wretchedness and illness entailed thereby upon the miserable mothers of these large and consequently half-starved families, is more than I am able to understand.

It is not, however, with the purpose of entering into discussion on the subject that I now write, but solely to express my entire agreement with the Rev. George Bladon, and my great satisfaction at seeing the subject thus brought forward in your paper. I am deeply convinced that it is a question of the most vital importance for the future of our race, and one in which it is hopeless to think of any reformation until the air is cleared of the false notions which at present prevail. And this I believe can only be done by men and women possessing the courage of their convictions who will raise their voices in the cause of suffering humanity, undeterred by fear of that obloquy which will probably be their reward for thus endeavouring to rescue their fellow-creatures from a state of hopelessly increasing misery and degradation.

(MRS.) CHARLOTTE STUART.

[We regard overcrowded dwellings as a sign and symptom, and not as a cause, of the demoralisation of the poor. Until our vast colonies in Australia, Canada, and South Africa are over-populated we maintain that early marriages and large families promote health and happiness, freedom from disease, and morality. Of the truth of this assertion the Jews are an enduring witness. Our Saviour taught that the ascetic was not the highest rule of life; and science, as well as experience, demonstrate that it is better in every respect to follow the dictates of Nature than the devices of Mr. Bradlaugh and others for checking the increase of population.—ED.]

IRISH RESPECT FOR THE DEAD AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

SIR,—We never read of sermons by Romish bishops or priests in Ireland without the most fulsome compliments to their hearers; of course these laudations are meant for English ears, "This is what Romanism would make *you* also, if you would receive it." Irishmen, meaning Romanists, we are told, are the most moral, devout, and obedient Christians in the world—as to morals, we will only say, that if one single virtue is meant by that term morals, the solution is, first, early marriages of boys and girls almost under age, and second, a life of hardship and almost starvation. As to any other moral virtues, the less said of drunkenness, dishonesty, and shedding of blood the better. But a letter in a late number of the *Freeman's Journal* (the priest's organ) opens our eyes as to respect for death and submission to clerical authority. "That the chamber of death," a "Dublin Priest" writes, "is in the majority of cases, by the practice of wakes, converted into a hell of drunkenness, immorality, card playing, singing, and sometimes dancing even, is proved by the sad experience of

most Irish priests; my fellow curate," he says, "lately returned *three times* in one night to a wake, and found the parties *he had previously dispersed each time reassembled*, and overheard in the conversation of the men and women present the grossest immorality, and witnessed drunkenness, and found near the head of the dead an old hag singing a revolting love song, and these scenes in the presence of children, too. Lately I turned at least thirty or forty sympathisers from a wake, and found there a *huge measure for drink*, and this where, *before death*, I could find scarce one attendant for the dying, or one drop of wine to moisten their lips! In a fashionable suburb within four miles of Dublin a couple of months or so ago, a priest of the parish visited by night a wake, and (I have it from one of the clergymen of that parish) found the corpse placed in a sitting posture, an umbrella tied over its head, a clay pipe in its mouth, while the room contained drunken men whom he dispersed with the aid of the police!" Can any heathen savages produce more barbarous scenes? a pipe stuck in the mouth of the corpse, an old hag sitting behind it singing lewd songs. Where can there be greater contempt of priest's authority, a mob three times dispersed and still returning to revel round the body of the dead. The police help required by the priest. The letter of the "Dublin Priest" in the *Freeman's Journal* was called forth by doings recorded of a wake in Waterford. The husband of the deceased rushed off to the police barracks to report that the corpse and coffin of his wife were hurried round the room, the coffin on its side, and the corpse *partly out of it*. These are the people, the most tender-hearted, reverent, and dutiful to their clergy. These are the people, fit every one of them, to exercise the franchise. Far better would it be if their teachers and other advisers would fit them for further powers, by teaching them, with what they already possess, to behave themselves as Christians, or at least as civilised people. I doubt if such barbarities could be found amongst the inhabitants of New Zealand, New Holland, or the Fiji Islands.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

INSPIRATION.

SIR,—Having been much engaged lately, I had not seen the back numbers of the PULPIT till now. I find you kindly inserted my paper on inspiration, and there is a reply to it and "Erigena" by "H. W." Justice cannot be done to this extensive and important subject in a few short papers. I have written and treated it more extensively in a pamphlet intended for publication, so must content myself with saying "H. W." mistakes the premises. The literal accuracy of the Biblical writers was of secondary importance in the view of the Divine Author; all that was necessary being that the amanuensis should render statements in such a manner as to be understood, without which no good would have followed. Again, there is strong evidence in favour of *remains* of inspiration in the East, if I may so term those works that have come down to us, which often contain a lofty spiritual feeling, though couched to us in archaic symbols, often unintelligible; too frequently mixed with a slime from later accretions. These facts become palpable when we compare the intellectual

status of those peoples with the static barbarous tribes* whose intellectual condition is but little removed from a low animal type, thus forbidding such means of elevation as inspiration confers—it could not have been understood had it been given. What is contended is that the advance of intelligence (however acquired), developed and expressed in the sacred language of Egypt, was expanded through the agency of Moses so as to contain an inspiration from God, adapted indeed in style to suit the capacity of the Israelites, but which to be fully comprehended must be opened by a key, the wards of which may be said to have been furnished by Jones of Nayland and others, without which a full view of the meaning couched in the Old Testament cannot be attained.

Dr. Zerff, in a recent lecture, said, "The Hebrews learned wisdom from the ancient Egyptians. But the deepest wisdom wrapt in allegories, metaphors, or mystic symbols, is a dead letter, an unintelligible language, which, like sacred ciphers, requires a key to be read by. Hebrew was the name of the sacred language of the Egyptians, it was called Obr or Abr, meaning a passage from one place to another, or transition, but in an allegorical sense, namely, from one passage in the sacred books to another. We are accustomed to pronounce it *ÆBR*."†

This key is very simple, and the knowledge required for its exercise is more ethical than intellectual. The Apostles by this key (which had been lost, but was restored to them by our Lord) endeavoured to enlighten the Gentiles by its means. We have already acknowledged they formerly possessed Revelation, but it had become a dead letter to them. The reasoning of the Apostles, however, is often misinterpreted in our day, owing to the key having again become corroded. Poets have often exhibited its powers of raising the soul from the tangible to the heavenly. Perhaps the most successful attempt in this direction is to be found in two articles by the late Rev. Dr. Thomson, which appeared in the *Expositor*. They are, entitled "God in Nature and in History."

Drummond's "Law in the Spiritual World" also aims to unfold the principle.

REFLECTOR.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE TWENTY THOUSAND CLERGY AND THE PRESENT CRISIS." By the Rev. R. H. Hessey, Vicar of Basing, Hants. London: W. Skeffington & Son, 1884. Pp. 46.

WE have perused with great pleasure this interesting little book, which deals with the important question of infidelity, and what action the clergy should take in dealing with it. It forms, we are told, the substance

of an address delivered at an Ember Conference of clergy at Great Malvern, and has since been enlarged into its present form.

In dealing with infidelity, the first question the author asks is this:—Are the 20,000 clergy to be cast aside as useless? Is *their* influence to be rejected? Are *they* unable to cope with the growing evil? And are we to wait for the slow and deliberate process of the training up of a new order of missionaries around us before we can begin to make a serious attack upon the infidel outworks that are growing in strength? And after urging that lay agency be enlarged for the purpose, he adds—"Don't forget the tried and loyal regular army, accustomed to fighting for their King, and longing, if some one did but press it upon them, to do more battle in His cause."

After alluding to the fact that in certain of the magazines of the day "are to be found, side by side with the writings of devoted believers in Christianity, the most unflinching advocacy of atheistic or agnostic thought," the author adds that the whole atmosphere is charged with these new speculations. "Our literature," he says, "is tinged with it; nay, our very universities too faithfully reflect the general disorder and rudderless condition of religious thought." Referring to the infidel contagion, he only too truly states that "the work of indoctrination is silently going on through the myriad newspapers which penetrate almost to the lowest *stratum*, and which are the self-adopted teachers of the fifty per cent. who it is understood never attend any place of worship whatever." In order to grapple with this state of things the author urges that in the pulpit lies one special department of duty in reference to what he calls this "unparalleled emergency," and suggests that it will be done not by doubtful disputation, but by calm, quiet, and uncontroversial laying down of the grounds upon which our faith rests, by incidentally, and rather by illustration than argument, removing obstacles from the path of belief, and by adding instances of men to whose judgments the hearers would defer, and whose deliberate verdict has been in favour of Christianity.

This last proposal is open to doubt and criticism, as we think it might be difficult in the pulpit to bring forth such a *catena* of authorities; and moreover there is the danger that in some parishes where the intellectual standard is not very high, that such an effort would, as it were, shoot over the heads of the people, and the result be that the congregation would be more mystified than edified by such references. The author draws a striking picture of how a child religiously brought up may, as he grows older, fall away by reading infidel books, and while flattering himself that he is open to conviction be at the same time deserting first principles; and in order to remedy this, suggests that the clergy should be careful to give clear statements of dogmatic truth. And this, we take it, is the duty of every ordained clergyman, for is he not bound by his solemn oath, made at his ordination, "to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines"? And the present time is one when it behoves all clergymen to see that they are fulfilling their solemn promise and vow. And not only in the pulpit does the author urge the necessity of giving clear and incisive teaching, but also in the parish in dealing with his people; and mentions the fact that while the poor are possessed of little culture, "there will be the squire and others in a similar position, whose doubts may remain quite unmet by the pastor's public utterances, and the

* Many of these barbarous tribes live in comparative vicinity of more advanced people in India and elsewhere, and though the Dravidian, Aryan, and European are often in contact, no means of cohesion have yet been found for their mutual benefit, they are not sufficiently developed.

† Professor Maurice thought Moses and the Egyptians treated analogy as a science. At all events our Lord and His Apostles thus translated those Scriptures attributed to Moses, the transition from the type to the anti-type—"representing by similar qualities," being an innate intuition of our common nature, so is quickly discovered by the most illiterate, when once the mind can be fixed on the subject.

clergyman, through diffidence of his own acquirements, as well as from other causes, shrinks from opening up those questions which some of his flock are longing to prove with him, who wish to know what he *really* thinks of those half-admitted conclusions which are sapping the strength of their own belief. The author urges that the pastor should be fully prepared to discuss these questions with them, and to help them out of their difficulties and doubts. We have quoted largely from the work before us, and can strongly recommend it to all, and especially the clergy; it seems to us that the plans marked out by the author for the clergy in dealing with infidelity are far superior to the plans adopted by the Guild of St. Matthew.

—◆—
 "THE MESSAGES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA MINOR." An Exposition of the first three chapters of the Book of the Revelation. By the Rev. Andrew Tait, LL.D., F.R.S.E., Canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Tuam, and Rector of Moylough, County Galway. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1884. Pp. 482.

THIS work we can earnestly recommend as a valuable addition to a theological library. Canon Tait has chosen a deeply interesting portion of Scripture, on which he has expended much time and careful study, and has in this volume given his readers much information and many interesting details. Though principally adapted to the theological student, it cannot fail to be interesting and instructive to most thoughtful readers of the Bible, and the soundness of its teaching, and its practical bearing on Christian life, make it a valuable work. The small map at the commencement of the volume shows the geographical position of the places mentioned, and adds greatly to the interest of the general reader. We sincerely hope this volume will have a large circulation amongst our subscribers and readers.

—◆—
 "THE UNIQUE GRANDEUR OF THE BIBLE." By the Rev. W. Anderson, M.A., Minister of the Octagon Chapel, Bath. London: Hatchards, 1884.

THIS is a book of a class of which we hope to see more, for if many more appear like it, those who assail Christianity will find that they have not got all the argument on their side, and will perhaps begin to doubt whether they have got much of the truth. It is an excellent exposition of the well-known argument for our religion, founded on the distinctiveness of the Bible from all other books, and on the distinctiveness of Christianity from all other religions, an argument which need never grow stale, if treated from time to time with that expansiveness which should grow as knowledge of science and of history expands. In one or two places the case of the superiority in degree of Christianity over those religions which are not entirely false, such as Islamism, is perhaps over-stated, but the reasoning throughout is sound, concisely written, and with that consecutiveness which is of great, if not essential importance to the completeness of a chain of argument. The portion of the book which is the most valuable is that which treats of the relation of the Bible to modern thought, meaning modern science and the ontology which is sometimes founded on it. The author admits in all candour that evolution, as a method, is a perfectly tenable, even

probable account, historically, of nature and its progress, while he is equally clear that it is not, and cannot be, a solution of the mystery of origin. "Revelation tells of *origin* depending on the will of God. Growths and developments according to the fixed laws of nature are left to science." When Mr. Anderson comes to deal with ethics he is less satisfactory. He is very conclusive as to the impossibility of applying the evolution theory to the science of ethics, either historically or otherwise, in fact is triumphant and almost contemptuous when he points out that modern utilitarian morality is lower in its conceptions than pagan morality of two thousand years ago. But his zeal leads him into expressions which make us think that he denies, or at least questions, the possibility of a science of ethics independent of its dependence on the will of a perfect God. Now we cannot coincide in this, in any other way than that in which the existence of an universe and the laws which govern it depend on the same. If science means certain knowledge of the laws of things, then there is no science excepting that which is mathematical; for the results to which we have attained in physics, including chemistry, the most absolute of all its branches, are not certainly true in the same manner as geometrical truth is true. All conclusions which rest on evidence are of a nature different from, and inferior to, mathematical conclusions, and similarly, the conclusions of metaphysics and of the science of morals are different in their kind of certainty from those belonging to physics. That there is an abstract science of morals, independent of the Christian revelation, we think is established by the fact of that revelation, which addresses itself to the conscience, and the existence of a conscience, of that faculty which apprehends moral truth, pre-supposes the existence of that truth which it, alone of our faculties, is capable of apprehending. We do not speak of this by way of disparagement of Mr. Anderson's work, which on the whole is admirable. It is divided into six chapters, each of them of about the length of an average sermon; but their composition is completely free from any conventionality of the average sermon kind.

—◆—
 AN anonymous donor has given £1,000 to the fund for the restoration of the parish Church of Bradford, Yorkshire, and £1,000 to the St. Chrysostom's Building Fund.

THE total expenditure on churches at Middlesborough during the past one-and-twenty years amounts to £34,250. This is said to be a larger expenditure on churches than in any other part of the diocese of York during the same period.—*Durham Advertiser*.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has written to the Rev. F. A. Thornton, vicar of St. Sepulchre, Northampton, congratulating him on the erection of St. Crispin's Church for shoemakers, recently opened in Mr. Thornton's parish. The Archbishop adds that he is glad to hear of such good work in the town, and encloses a cheque for £10 towards the cost of the new Church.

WE are informed that the monumental brass which has been placed in Bristol Cathedral to the memory of Mr. Arthur Palmer, first Judge of the Bristol County Court, is the gift of his son, the Rev. Julian Roquette-Palmer-Palmer, and was designed and executed by Messrs. Singer. It is surmounted by

a very chaste and elaborate canopy, and supported by emblazoned bannerets, displaying family and civic heraldic arms.

MR. J. M. HOLT has written to the *Record* on behalf of the Council of the Church Association. He says:—"Our desire and design are simply to ascertain whether the law can be brought to bear on a Bishop or a churchwarden who neglects his duty; because we cannot think it possible that there is, nor right that there should be, in this country, any class of men, in Church or State, who can trample upon the law with impunity. I endeavoured to state this plainly at Birmingham, and to guard myself against misapprehension."

AT Lincoln Cathedral there will be special sermons on the Sunday afternoons in Advent, the preachers being—November 30th, Canon Mason; December 7th, the Rev. J. Gray Richardson, vicar of Monks Kirby; December 14th, Canon Twells, rector of Waltham; December 21st, Dr. Jessopp, rector of Scarning. On Wednesday evenings the preachers will be—December 3rd, Canon Bullock, vicar of Holy Trinity, Leeds; December 10th, Canon Hole; December 17th, Canon Maclure, vicar of Rochdale; December 24th, the Rev. W. Wanstall, vicar of St. Andrew's.

APPLICATION will be made next session for an Act to erect a cathedral for the diocese of Liverpool in lieu of the parish church of St. Peter. The Bill contains clauses providing for the acquisition of the Church of St. John; for taking it down and appropriating its site; and for uniting for ecclesiastical purposes the districts of St. Peter and St. John. The Bill also contains provisions for the raising of money, by voluntary subscriptions or otherwise; for the creation of a Dean and Chapter; for the establishment of a Chapter Endowment Fund; and for incorporating trustees for carrying the Act into execution.

A SERIES of Sunday afternoon lectures on the "Comparative Study of Religions" is announced to be delivered at St. Andrew's, Stockwell, by the Rev. W. Cunningham, B.D., whose name has lately come into notice in connection with the "Labour and Capital Congress." The course, which has already been given at Cambridge with great success, begins on Advent Sunday, and will, we hope, command a large audience, being at an hour which is one of general leisure, on a subject which cannot fail to be of deep interest to all those who are

Studious more to see

Great truths, than touch and handle little ones,

and by a lecturer so well able to handle his subject as Mr. Cunningham.

A MISSION-ROOM has been opened at West Wellow, near Romsey. It was built for about seventy persons; but the congregation at the first service was nearly a hundred. In the evening the room was again crowded to overflowing. The Rev. C. H. Grundy, Wilberforce Missioner for South London and organising secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Society, delivered an address, in which he dwelt upon the benefits of a mission-room for the religious life of the neighbourhood, and advised those who lived near to avail themselves of the opportunity now given them. Tea was served in a large marquee, erected in Mr. Riddell's grounds. The vicar (the Rev. G. Meyrick-Jones) expressed his sense of thankfulness that the

good work had been brought to a successful issue. After thanking his curate, the Rev. R. W. Oldham, who had been mainly instrumental in carrying the work through, he called upon Mr. Richards, the minister of the Wesleyan Chapel, to address the company. Mr. Richards said he felt a hearty sympathy with all that was being done for the real religious welfare of the people, and he trusted that the work now entered upon would promote the good of many souls. He prayed that God's blessing might be given to the work. The room was opened free of debt.

CERTAIN details in the restoration of Peterborough Cathedral have caused a protest on the part of the Bishop. The committee proposed to deviate somewhat from the original design, and his lordship has intimated that unless the edifice is restored in accordance with that design he shall withdraw his promised subscription. The committee's proposals are that the sills of the windows in the great central tower should be in a line with the apex of the ridge of the roofs, instead of being at a much lower level, as formerly. The result of that alteration would have been that the roof of the replaced tower would be on a level with the top surface of the four turrets put up to relieve the squat tower by Dean Kipling in the restoration of 1830. Dean Perowne has issued a circular in vindication of the committee. He contends that the raising of the tower against which the Bishop protests was in the original contract. Mr. Pearson, R.A., had furnished a design for a very noble tower, and had proposed to restore the discovered fragments of the Norman lantern and a large portion of the Norman arcading. The tower would thus be raised 15 ft., and if it is not done now it will hereafter be impossible, except by aiding some incongruous superstructure to the low squat fourteenth-century tower. The Dean adds that the subscriptions already promised will far more than cover the cost of one stage of the tower, and he urges the speedy removal of the misunderstandings, especially as the works are at present delayed.

A MEETING was held in the Hall of Clare College, Cambridge, on the 18th inst., to consider the subject of the College Mission. The Master presided. The Bishop of Rochester was to have been present, but was prevented from attending. The Rev. C. H. Grundy, organising secretary to the Rochester Diocesan Society, addressed the meeting on the spiritual and material needs of South London. Subsequently an executive committee was elected. The Rev. W. T. Lawson (an old Clare man) was appointed Missioner. It is hoped that work will commence either in Walworth or Rotherhithe at the beginning of next year.

ON Monday week the annual meeting of the St. John's College, Cambridge, Mission in Walworth was held in the College Hall, Cambridge, the Master in the chair. The meeting was addressed by Canon Rowsell, the Rev. Harry Jones, and the Missioner, the Rev. W. J. Phillips. The Mission work began on Septuagesima Sunday last, and the progress made up to the present time is very encouraging. The Missioner has gathered together a little band of communicants, and he has more Sunday School children than he can find teachers for. Concerts and lectures have been given by members of the college, and a working men's club has been opened. During the Long Vacation the Missioner had always two or three undergraduates residing with him in his house

and helping him in his work. The Missioner has an enthusiastic band of supporters in the College; its great need at present is regular personal help from Johnians resident in London.

THE ancient church of Cliffe-at-Hoo, one of the finest in the county of Kent, has lately been undergoing very important restoration. This place is identified, locally, traditionally, and by the best antiquarian authorities, with the historic Cloveshoo, where several councils of the Saxon Church were held between A.D. 742 and 824, which have left their mark on our present Prayer-book in the final address to the Sponsors in the Baptismal Service, requiring that the child shall learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. The church, which is 150 feet in length, was formerly disfigured by a long flat nave and chancel roof, on either side of which arose a transept with a high pitched roof sheer above the nave. There was also a hideous roundheaded east window of brick, the apex of the original window having been cut away by the low chancel roof. By the efforts of the present rector, the Rev. Stanley Leathes, and his family, and by the ingenuity of the architect, Mr. Romaine Walker, a marvellous restoration has been effected. The entire roof of the nave and chancel has been raised to the height of the transept roofs which have been joined so as to make a cruciform roof, and a very fine decorated flamboyant east window has been inserted in correspondence with the other six very fine chancel windows. The architect had no difficulty in designing an east window according to the analogy of the other windows of the chancel, but when the brickwork of the modern east window began to be taken out large portions of the stone tracing of the original window were discovered in the rubbish, and this to such an extent as to enable him to correct his own conjectural design and accurately to reproduce the original window. All who have seen this work and the noble five-light east window, which measures twenty feet by fifteen, have been delighted with it. Unfortunately there still remains a large portion of work wanted to be done to the rest of the church, which, owing to long neglect, is in a lamentable state of decay, and for this a sum of nearly a thousand pounds is required before it can be attempted. But it can hardly be that the requisite funds will not be forthcoming since the result of the present outlay has been so eminently satisfactory.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baldwin, Rev. Charles, K.C.L., Vicar of Berwick-upon-Tweed; Honorary Canon of Newcastle Cathedral.
 Bartlett, Rev. Ernest William, Curate of Smarden, Kent; Vicar of Queenborough, Isle of Sheppey.
 Blomfield, Rev. Alfred Charles Edward, M.A.; Vicar of Skelbrooke.
 Burrage, Rev. Thomas Waters, M.A., Vicar of Eastbury, Berks.
 Davies, Rev. Daniel George, M.A., Vicar of Dixton; Rector of Shirenewton, Monmouthshire.
 Davies, Rev. David Griffith, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Pontypridd, Glamorganshire.
 Davies, Rev. William, B.A., Vicar of Llanfihangel Gneur Glyn; Perpetual Curate of Llanllawddog, Carmarthenshire.
 Dean, Rev. Henry, B.D., Vicar of St. Giles's, Oxford.
 Dixon, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Warkworth; Rural Dean of Alnwick.
 Garnier, Rev. Thomas Parry, M.A., Rector of Cranworth-with-Letton; Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral.

Gray, Rev. Edmund, M.A., Rector of West Rounton.
 Green, Rev. Charles Edward, B.A., Curate of Embleton; Vicar of Howick.
 Harford, Rev. E. J., Vicar of Bathford; Rural Dean of Keynsham.
 Hutchinson, Rev. Henry Tesdale, Vicar of Boulton, Derbyshire.
 Jones, Rev. Edward Thomas, Vicar of St. Dogmael's, Pembrokeshire; Vicar of Whitechurch-with-St. Elvis, Pembrokeshire.
 Jones, Rev. James, Chaplain of the Glamorganshire Lunatic Asylum, Bridgend.
 Lloyd, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Newcastle; Chaplain to the Bishop of Newcastle.
 Maclean, Rev. Douglas, M.A., Rector of Codford St. Peter.
 Milner, Rev. W. M. H., B.A., Assistant-Curate of Barnard Castle; Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for Exeter Diocese.
 Muzzell, Rev. William, Incumbent of the New Church of St. Mark (Holland-street), Newton-heath.
 Partington, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A. (Oxon), Incumbent of the New Church of St. Ambrose, Chorlton-upon-Medlock.
 Pawson, Rev. Lewis, L.Th., Rector of Kildale.
 Powell, Rev. William, Rector of Bangor Teifi-with-Henllan; Perpetual Curate of Newcastle Emlyn, Carmarthenshire.
 Radcliffe, Rev. Arthur Caynton, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary, Longfleet.
 Reese, Rev. John Wesley, formerly Curate, Rector of Nolton-with-Roch, Pembrokeshire.
 Rogers, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Mus.D., Precentor of Durham; Vicar of Roxwell, Chelmsford.
 Sproule, Rev. Arthur St. Quentin, M.A., Senior Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist, Norwood, Hon. Chaplain to the Earl of Kinnoull; Vicar of Plymstock, near Plymouth.
 Summers, Rev. E., lately Head Master of Rosse's School, Abingdon; Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight.
 Teesdale, Rev. F. B., Incumbent of Wheatenhurst *alias* Whitminster.
 Thiselton-Dyer, Rev. Thomas Ferminger, M.A., Rector of Bayfield, Norfolk.
 Trotter, Rev. Edward Bush, M.A., Vicar of Alnwick.
 Welby, Rev. Montagu Earle, M.A., Vicar of Llanlleonvel, Brecon; Rector of Grosmont, Glamorganshire.
 Whiteside, Rev. Miles, M.A., Rector of St. Nicholas, Glamorganshire.
 Wood, Rev. Charles C., M.A., Licensed Priest, Diocese of Southwell.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barfoot-Saunt, Rev. Frederic, at Melbury Bubb Rectory, on the 18th inst., aged 76.
 Bowditch, Rev. William Penwick, M.A., for forty years Vicar of St. Andrew's, at Wakefield, Yorkshire, on the 16th inst.
 Bradley, Rev. Arthur, M.A., for twenty-two years Rector of All Saints', Southampton, and formerly Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, at All Saints' Rectory, Southampton, on the 17th inst., aged 60.
 Brown, Rev. Thomas, upwards of sixty years Rector of Hemingstone, and for more than half a century an active magistrate for the county of Suffolk, at Hemingstone Rectory, near Ipswich, on the 18th inst.
 Colton, Rev. W. C., for twenty years Rector of Leaden Roding, at the Rectory, on the 19th inst., aged 73.
 Dupuis, Rev. George John, Fellow and Vice-Provost, at Eton Cloisters, on the 22nd inst., aged 88.
 Feilden, Rev. Henry James, for sixty-four years Rector of Kirk Langley, Derby, at the Rectory, on the 21st inst., aged 88.
 Johnson, Rev. Frederick, Curate of Christ Church, Bexleyheath, and for nine years previously of St. Mary's, Ewell, Surrey, at Eastbourne, on the 19th inst., aged 39.
 Marshall, Rev. Joseph Hepstinstall, M.A., Vicar of Sidlesham, near Chichester, on the 24th inst.
 Otter, Rev. George, M.A., late Vicar of Hucknall Torkard, Nottinghamshire, at Radcliffe-on-Trent, on the 23rd inst., aged 81.
 Rhodes, Rev. William, at Chale Rectory, on the 15th inst., aged 36.
 Warner, Rev. Simeon Burney, late Rector of Clyst St. Mary, South Devon, at 67, Cromwell-road, Brighton, on the 21st inst., aged 64.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ON CATHEDRAL SERVICE.

BY THE VERY REV. JOHN OAKLEY, D.D., DEAN
OF MANCHESTER.

SERMON PREACHED IN CHESTER CATHEDRAL ON
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17TH, 1884.

"We, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."—ROMANS xii. 5.

NO one can doubt that our cathedrals are once more, as we are fond of saying in England, on their trial. Few are prepared to say that the last half century has found them altogether wanting. But the reforming energy which followed the first Reform Bill left much to be desired, and not a little to undo, in its ecclesiastical field of action. It is true, but it is not the whole truth, that the movement of which the Ecclesiastical Commission is the great monument, and the still active organ, was set in motion in profound ignorance of the idea and of the capabilities of a cathedral. Small blame to the politicians of the time. If generation after generation had been accustomed to see cathedral dignities used as pensions for younger sons of titled houses, or as provision for Bishops' families, or at best as the reward of clergy distinguished for their social qualities, or perhaps only for obsequiousness, who can wonder if—in spite of the noble exceptions to the dead level of inutility, which under any system, however vicious, are sure to emerge at times—who can wonder if the politician, who had found a new Liberal cry in Church reform, or even the statesman dimly conscious of a great force wasted, handled it with what is now to us an amazing hardihood and want of all regard for ideas, and even for principles, beyond the great and sound one of removing some of the monstrous inequalities of ecclesiastical incomes by augmenting the poorest livings? Who can wonder, who knows anything of English public life, and recalls the mood of public men fifty years ago, when public offices were just ceasing to be the recognised perquisites of a few families—who can wonder, if one chief visible result of that great endeavour to "set the Church's house in order," by the application of external force, has been the formation of a new vested interest, through the foundation of an enormous public office administering Church estates at an unreasonable cost, while the present generation is begging devout women, and religious working people, for half-

crowns and sixpences to found new bishoprics and build new cathedrals? I am not disparaging what was done upon the whole, but merely implying that we ought to profit by the well-meant blunders of honest ignorance, and to shape our own course of further improvement on the lines of principle and history and fact, to try to form and to realise ideas of what the chief church of a Christian diocese should be.

I. Let me try and set down a few of these recognised ideas:—1. A cathedral is the corollary and symbol of an Episcopate. Its name is the mere crystallised summary of all Church history. It is the Bishop's church. It affirms and extends the idea of his office, as the *persona* of the Christian society, within the limits which Church and State have agreed to assign to him. It witnesses to the facts of history and the ideas of Scripture that the Bishop—*i.e.*, the father, and not the congregation—*i.e.*, the children—is the centre of organic action and the source of Church authority. It substitutes large ideas for small, and witnesses that the diocese, the Bishop's cure of souls, is the true unit of the Christian corporation, and not the mere parish or the presbyter's cure of souls. 2. Anciently organised and worked by a religious community—specially charged with the duty of continual and solemn worship; still officered and administered by the modern equivalent, an anomalous, but not ineffective society of cultivated secular clergy—the cathedrals of England represent, not only the Episcopal idea, but also the constitutional idea which is at the root of all Christian organisation. Episcopacy is not despotism. But Episcopacy without a cathedral, or without a real sense and use of a cathedral, in its proper functions, has no chance of escaping the snare of despotism. To claim the cathedral as the Bishop's church is not to say that the Bishop is the church, or that he is everything, and every one else nothing at all. It is to say the exact contrary. It is to say that in his own church, by his side, so that he cannot even go to church without seeing it, he has the framework of that constitutional, as we now say, or, as an earlier generation might have said without misunderstanding or offence, that socialistic or communistic—or, to use a word on which party spirit has not yet laid its hand—that co-operative system of Church life and order which the cathedrals, however dimly, still represent. There sits his council around him. There flourishes in some degree the cœnobitic life, which has been cherished in the Church since the days and the Acts of the Apostles as the ideal of brotherhood and fellowship—that associated Christian life which is still the witness, however shadowy and obscured, of the great primitive idea of the Catholic Apostolic Church, when "they had all things common; neither said any man that any of the things which he possessed was his own."

I can well imagine Deans and Canons, no less than laymen, smiling at the suggestion! But that ideal is here, or nothing is here much worth preserving! As it is the Christian Church—chiefly through its conventual and cathedral churches—which taught Christendom and Europe the political principles of ruling by representation and debate, which we now call Constitutional, so have the conventual and collegiate churches, through whatever hindrances and defects, witnessed to the true type of Christian social organisation, kept up a true witness against the anti-Christian idea of unqualified competition, and taught us “not to look every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.” They have declared that there was and is a true sense to the watchwords of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity; and so, in like manner, they may still be found capable, with God’s blessing, of convincing the modern world that the Christian Church still grasps the principles and shares the aspirations which most stir and move modern man; that she still proclaims and realises, with whatever drawbacks and defects, the Apostolic maxim “that we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.”

II. I pass to another aspect of cathedrals, their function of maintaining a high ideal, and a noble form of worship. Need we ask ourselves what worship really is? It is any form of realising the Presence of Almighty God, which must always induce what we call worship. The chief field and seat of public worship is, of course, the visible dedicated houses of God, with all their ministries and appliances for making the presence of God a felt reality. “My house is the house of prayer” is the witness both of Old Testament and New Testament. And prayer is the generic name used by our Lord Himself to describe and include all modes of access to the unseen but Living and Eternal God; praise, sacraments, preaching, teaching, and exposition, meditation, and private prayer—these are all covered by His words. And these are all fit and necessary uses of every house of God, parochial or cathedral. And if so, then pre-eminently is the cathedral—or to use other words for the same idea, the central or normal church of the diocese—bound to provide for them all, in their best and highest forms. I can but name three or four points in which it seems that the chief church of the diocese should excel in the way of providing opportunities of worship and in upholding its high ideal.

a. The cathedral pulpit, beyond all others, should witness to the principles of the Christian religion and the doctrines of the Christian faith. I shall not be supposed to put preaching before all things. But it comes conveniently first.

And there is a tendency, even amongst religious people, to be impatient of teaching and to dispense with the words of edification which have always

accompanied Christian worship, onward from Apostolic times, which I see no reason whatever for humouring over-much! The cathedral pulpit, I say, may very well leave much which is fitting enough in other places to those other fitter places. It may, of course, be made a rallying point upon occasion for teachers and taught, in order that they may be addressed by some influential voice on lines outside the ordinary use of it—as when the Bishop of Lichfield or the Bishop of Bedford have addressed the assembled communicants’ guilds of a diocese, or the converts of a Church Army, in the nave of a cathedral, or when special services for working men have been held in St. Paul’s. It may be used, in a word, exceptionally, for any and every kind of pulpit ministry. But I submit that it should ordinarily be its main object and character to witness to the permanent and fundamental aspects of the faith and practice of Christ’s religion. The continuous and detailed exposition and illustration of Holy Scriptures, the authority and obligation of the creeds, the use and necessity of the sacraments in the Christian life, the duty of worship as an essential principle of the Gospel, no less than of the law, the reality and binding obligation of definite and outward religious duties as distinct from the mere adoption of what “I think,” “I like,” “I choose;” in a word, the proper proportion, or relation, or analogy, of the various elements of faith and duty, the right dividing of the word of truth—these are surely the main and characteristic responsibilities of the pulpit of this or any other cathedral church. So that if any restless or curious modern Christian (I use the word in its older significance) is led to complain that the service and preaching in a cathedral does not exactly correspond with the exercises of the Salvation Army, he is bearing witness, however unwittingly, to an important fact and principle which is wholly to, and not against, the credit of the cathedral! But I have said enough to lay the ground for my first point

b. In the next place, it belongs to the same conception of a cathedral, as the exponent of the highest and most abiding ideas and duties of religion, that it should firmly keep the Christian sacraments in their proper and appointed place; as the witness and instrument and application of the revealed truths and spiritual facts which Holy Scripture affirms, and which the Christian pulpit expounds and enforces. I cannot dwell upon a topic so obvious and familiar. But it is clear that the Church and the Christian Institution which witnesses for the first principles of practical Christianity—viz., that it is a family, with father and elder brethren, reproducing the relationship of natural life, a family with a common home, with its appointed duties and days and hours, nay, even a common table, with its sacred meals—it is obvious that a Church which essays to do this must needs be emphatic and distinct in every

assertion of the fact, must be frequent, regular, and persuasive in the spreading of God's Board, and in the use of all which conduces to a right apprehension of the place of the great sacrament of the Gospel in Christian life and worship. I pause only to say earnestly that this, which I will call the Gospel of the Eucharist, is not preached amongst us as practically, as fearlessly, as profitably as it might be preached. It bears its message often and often where the pulpit has come to be disregarded altogether. Let but the heart be touched, and the spirit quickened to the point of asking, "Was not for me the victim slain? Am I forbid the children's bread?" and argument is superseded and controversy put out of court. Again and again hearts and minds unreached, and even hardened, by argument or eloquence have been led to feel in the solemn silence of the Communion feast that God is in our assemblies of a truth :—

No Gospel like this Feast,
Spread for Thy Church by Thee,
Nor prophet, nor Evangelist,
Preach the gladness so free !

c. And from this point we pass naturally to two subordinate points more closely connected with this afternoon's service. The upholding of these high ideals of Christian truth and worship implies the use of all suitable agencies and methods of doing so—such as good music, artistic and devotional, and a skilled choir of the religious value of which I need say nothing more to you to-day. It also explains the uniform association with the cathedrals of Christendom of choir schools, in which Christian lads may be trained, not only in the service of the sanctuary, but in those elements of sound learning and mental discipline which tend to produce the intelligent as well as the devout Christian. If the cathedral is to be through its pulpit the educating agency of the diocese in spiritual things, it follows that it cannot neglect to form and train the minds of the children whom it employs—as children have always been employed—in God's earthly sanctuaries to sing His praise.

Of the musical department I have but a single thought to offer you. Whatever be the case practically with parish churches, it is surely clear, not only that the highest application of sacred music is to the highest service of the Christian sanctuary, but that in modern cathedrals, at all events—with every facility for doing so, and every inducement to do it—the great Oblation of the new law, the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, should be at least weekly pleaded and partaken of, to the accompaniment of those immemorial strains of love and praise which have attended it ever since our Lord and the eleven sang a hymn or psalm as they passed out of the upper chamber, across the Kedron, and under the olives of Gethsemane, to the slopes of

the Mount of Olives—strains of Eucharistic praise in which, I am ashamed to say, many a humble Nonconformist chapel puts many of the ancient shrines and stately fanes of England utterly to shame ! Myself, connected with a cathedral where this characteristic service of the Lord's Day is always sung, and lately with one where it was not, I can testify to the ease with which the arrangements for doing so can be carried out, and to its helpfulness and acceptableness to Christian people, as well as to the confusion and loss of proportion, both in doctrine and practice, which is apt to arise where only Matins and Evensong are sung, and the Communion service not.

Of the choir school I need, perhaps, say still less. You know its character and working here. Its old relation with the Cathedral Grammar-school, which is itself a witness to the same fact of the responsibility of the Church to teach and instruct in every branch of sound learning and religious education, this ancient relation has been, it seems, very wisely restored. The gain to the boys in breadth, and tone, and quality of education is obvious. I trust that your willing liberality to-day, as well as in the weekly offertory (which I congratulate you on having in full operation here), will sustain the Dean of Chester in his wise and liberal endeavour to set the choir school on a footing of efficiency in all respects. I can well sympathise with the prudent apprehensions of his brethren, which have left this matter mainly in the hands of the Dean, speaking as I do as one of a Capitular Body, which is bound indeed by statute to educate its choristers, but which is now, on some quaint construction of a modern Act of Parliament, forbidden as a body to keep a choir school or to pay a schoolmaster !

Your enterprise here, however, is not likely to fail in the able and energetic hands which have raised and spent so wisely, so artistically, so practically, a sum of nearly £100,000 for the benefit of the cathedral and diocese of Chester.

I content myself with reminding you of the fact, and appealing to you—I am bold to say bidding you—to do your part in this small branch of that real work of restoration which is commended to your Christian zeal to-day. Let us hope, too, and pray that this work of Christian education which we are furthering to-day may bear its proper fruit, and that many a Christian lad, trained and educated here—like the boy Samuel in the Temple courts—to recognise and obey the Divine voice, may be taught to make the only Christian answer to the Divine call—"Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth."

III. I have kept a last point for the briefest concluding remarks. It is a repetition, no doubt, in some degree, but it is the repetition of the keynote of what has been said from first to last, with whatever passing modulations. It is that the cathedral should be the standing monument

and organ of the principle of the text. Fellowship is my first and last word on the ideas of the cathedral. It is not visionary, it is not impossible. The revived and reanimated English cathedrals of the nineteenth century are demonstrating its feasibility. We differ no doubt. Men will always differ. Clergy differ, laymen differ, cathedrals differ, deans differ. I will not dare to carry the confession higher up. But we all differ. What a support, what a consolation, when we are driven to feel this, as we sometimes are, very bitterly, in the din of parties, and journals, and sometimes even of pulpits; what a help to meet, as we do to-day, on common ground, to be able to realise that there is after all, not only in idea, but in fact, a presentment of the common truth, a form of the common duty of worship, in which we can all take our part simply and thankfully. I honestly believe that modern cathedrals can hardly discharge a more useful function than in thus drawing and holding together, each in its own diocese, the members of the one Body. You have learnt the secret here. It is not so everywhere. Be thankful for it; cherish it; promote and encourage every possible opportunity for the meeting of Cheshire Church-folk, lay or clerical, teachers or taught, old or young, as was done yesterday, as we are doing to-day, in the mother Church of the diocese. Cynics may call it sentimental, obstructives may try to sneer it down as "fussy," men without enthusiasm may ask you to show them on paper what good it does. Never mind; it keeps alive the sense of the unity and fellowship of the Christian Church. The parish sees itself in its true light and proportions. The plodding or reading parish priest sees another line of thought laid open to him; he sees habits of study and action combined. He sees an impulse and a form given to the ideas which have been working, it may be ineffectually, in his own mind and life. He may need a little imagination, or, let us rather say, a little faith. But with this open eye to the word and promise of God, and the witness of the Christian centuries, he will, I solemnly believe, be helped, in the restored cathedrals of to-day, to realise that the Acts of the Apostles is not superannuated, nor the Apostolic ideas a day-dream. He will see reason and find help to regard and treat as a practical truth the Apostolic doctrine that "We, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." Amen.

THE *Church Review* says that Canon Carter has, for the first time in his life, been asked to preach in Westminster Abbey, but it is thought that his advanced age and weak voice will prevent his acceptance of the invitation. The Pusey Library and its work are satisfying its promoters. Upwards of sixty students attend the Sunday morning lecture on the Sermon on the Mount, conducted by the Rev. C. Gore, at noon.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d. twelve months, 10s. 10d. are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1884.

DIOCESAN CONFERENCES.

IT is constantly stated that the Church of England was never so alive to her duties and her great responsibilities as she is at the present time, and if there is anything required to give as proof of this assertion, we at once point among other things to the various Diocesan Conferences which are now holding their meetings. Every diocese in the kingdom, with one solitary exception—Worcester—has now its conference, and although some are only of recent date, as for instance, that formed for the great metropolis, yet all are doing a good work, and we trust for the sake of the clergy and laity living in the diocese of Worcester that those in authority may ultimately see their way to call one together. As the result of these various assemblies there has been formed the Central Council, which, although it has no legislative function, and is not as yet recognised by all the dioceses; yet at the same time it is a powerful factor in the formation of opinion on various ecclesiastical matters, and if it should attain no definite *status*, yet it is well to have this deliberative assembly formed by delegates from various dioceses, who shall discuss the questions of the day. The conferences which are in existence are not assemblies consisting exclusively of clergy, although the clerical element largely preponderates, but we have also the lay element, men of power and of skill, some of legal acumen, together with some Members of Parliament, and it may be that the infusion of this element has tended in no slight degree to give tone to the debates which have been held. At the Church Congress, while opinions are freely expressed on different subjects, it is wisely arranged that no votes are taken, but in the

various conferences which have been held, when certain subjects have been discussed, whether affecting the welfare of the Church in general, or the special needs of the diocese in particular, in order to gain the clear and definite opinion of those assembled, the question is put to the vote, and the decision thus arrived at is considered final. Another lesson which these conferences have taught us is that of self-government; if, therefore, disestablishment ever should come, much as we should deplore it, the lessons that they have taught us will not be in vain, nor the time spent in deliberations wasted. Dissenters may still continue to taunt us with the sneer that we cannot help ourselves; that we are bound hand and foot to the State, and that without recourse to the legislature we cannot alter a single rubric or make a new canon, and cannot decide our own differences, but we shall have learned the important duty of coming and expressing our opinion without fear or favour as to the practical working of our dioceses, and the machinery necessary to make things work more easily and better. We shall also have more clearly seen that truth has many sides, and that the oftener Churchmen come together, the better do they understand one another. There is a further advantage that these conferences have been the means of bringing about, and that is this, the Bishop of the Diocese is brought into closer relationship with the laity, the thinking men, who are not likely to be biassed, and whose minds are not cast into a narrow ecclesiastical groove, nor yet warped by the shibboleth of party warfare. Any meeting is of use that can make men, whether laity or clergy, realise that they are parts of one great whole; that the interest of the Church is the interest of the people, and that while she looks after the higher and spiritual welfare, she does not forget other perhaps more fundamental matters concerning the health of the people, whether it be the housing of the poor, or the question of social purity. There is one subject which was discussed at the recent Ripon Diocesan Conference, and which must commend itself to all sensible men, and that is the subject of Clergy Pensions. When we consider the number of clergymen who are beneficed, but whose benefices are so small that it is scarcely possible for them to put by any money, especially if they have the expense of educating and bringing up a family, the necessity and advantage of such pensions is obvious. Now the time comes when the incumbent feels unequal to the task of ministering to his people and that the burden should fall on a younger man; he would gladly resign and content himself with some lighter work which would not demand so much mental anxiety, but he cannot do it, because if he should resign what is the prospect before him? Nothing but starvation unless perchance he is blessed with private means. If, how-

ever, there were a sustentation or superannuation fund, it would enable him to resign the heavier burden, and find comfort in the thought that his declining years were provided for. The same remark applies to the unbeneficed clergy. When we consider the number of clergy who are in the position of assistant curates, we feel that there needs some fund from which they may derive support after they have passed a certain age, to which fund they shall subscribe so much during the earlier years of their life. And if the Bishop's suggestion were acted upon, viz., that the Archdeacons should form themselves into a board to discriminate on the merits of each case great advantage would accrue. We have only just touched the edge of a very important and interesting subject. If the diocesan conferences can be the means of bringing these and other practical subjects before Churchmen they will not have existed in vain, neither will their deliberations have been fruitless, but they will tend to make, what is so much to be desired, the establishment the Church of the people.

Erratum.—Our reviewer of Dr. Hobart's "Medical Language of St. Luke," desires to make a correction. In the concluding portion, where he enumerates the peculiar words of each Evangelist, the peculiarity is in reference to the other Gospels only, while respecting the Book of Acts the peculiar words are in reference to the Gospels only.

THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE.

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN ON NOVEMBER 10TH, 1884.

BY C. P. REICHEL, DEAN OF CLONMACNOIS.

THE eloquent address to which you have listened with riveted attention touches on so many interesting and important points, that you will not expect me to go into it with any fulness. I can only use the opportunity for the purpose of making some desultory remarks on the connection which I believe to exist between science and religion.

There is a connection between science and the first postulate of religion—the Being of a God. In all the fulness of the Divine Name, science cannot introduce us to Him. Physical science has nothing in herself to do with morality, and therefore can tell us nothing of the moral attributes of God. But to the existence of God, science in its latest discoveries seems to me to bear conclusive witness. In past ages it might not be unreasonable to think that the universe, such as we know a part of it, as a scene of energy and life, might be eternal. The planetary movements might continue for ever, there being no friction, as it was then thought. Our sun, and of course other suns, might continue for ever to give out heat and light, the light and heat apparently wasted being in some way returned to it. This last idea was indeed quite recently again propounded, but not accepted by

anyone so far as I know save its author. But the discovery of the existence of friction in various ways, *e.g.*, by the action of the tides, by the possible action of the luminiferous ether on bodies passing through it; and still more the discovery that heat and motion are not capable of being transformed backwards and forwards into each other without degradation of energy, has made it an elementary truth that the universe is slowly tending towards rest; absolute cessation of motion as the result of the equable diffusion of its heat, the result of which again will be the death of every living organism in it. What will cease to move must at some time have begun to move; what will die must have been born; and this beginning of motion and life cannot have been self-caused, else it would be eternal. Thus science postulates an origin of motion and of life outside the phenomenal universe, and such an origin is God.

Years ago this argument occurred to me when the doctrine of the correlation of forces was first expounded in a popular shape by the late Provost Lloyd in his inaugural address as President of the British Association, and on consulting him I found that he quite accepted it, a conclusion he confirmed only a couple of years before his death. I need not tell you that no earthly consideration would have gained his assent to what he thought a fallacy, no matter how good the cause supported by it. He was indeed an admirable specimen of that order of scientific clergymen, to whom, in spite of Professor Tyndall, science owes so much. That eminent man some years ago thought proper to warn off clergymen from the domain of science, as being ground too lofty for them, an atmosphere too ethereal for their prejudices. But so long as we can exhibit men like Whewell, and Peacock, and Pritchard, and Lloyd, and Jellett, and Salmon, and our late lamented Richard Townsend, not to mention a host in past times up to the Canon Copernicus, and the poor curate Jeremiah Horrox, who first turned the transit of Venus to account, we need not much regard the admonitions even of a Tyndall, though backed up by what seems to be the determination of the great scientific association of the day that no cleric shall again occupy its chair.

Given, by physical science, the existence of a God, of a First Mover or Disposer, if not Creator, and we are authorised to infer his qualities, in some degree, from his works; and though the highest of them known to us—not in bulk, but in quality, I mean man—is very imperfect, we may nevertheless read in his moral nature a revelation, doubtless imperfect likewise, of the moral nature of the Deity. Streams cannot flow higher than their sources, and it is impossible to think that God can be inferior in morality to man, or, as Spinoza teaches, that he is a thinking, but not understanding Being, destitute of will, or love, or affection of any kind. The anthropomorphism which is justly objected to by many writers is not the conception that God possesses, in an infinite degree, all excellence conceivable by man or feebly exemplified in man; but that God represents the defects of man. The Psalmist's argument is as reasonable as it is plain: "He that made the eye, shall He not see? He that planted the ear, shall He not hear?" Shall He not possess, in supreme perfection, powers of which seeing and hearing, such as we know them, are imperfect transcripts? And this may be fitly carried further, as it is by the Psalmist: He that gave man understanding, the power to apprehend the moral law (which is what the Old Testament always means

by understanding), shall He not punish man's infractions of that law? In other words, shall God not be a moral being, and as such a judge, a redresser of wrongs? And does not this very plain and obvious argument seem to demand the continuance of our personal existence into a state where wrongs unredressed here shall be righted, and the moral nature of the Godhead shall be fully disclosed and vindicated?

Physical science, then, added to mental science; the investigation of the phenomena of matter and of the mind, goes far in putting our feet on secure ground. But it is obvious that nothing inconsistent with either of these departments of science must be held, whether under the name of science or of religion. Theories which present God as an immoral, or at least an unmoral agent; which crush our own consciousness and our feeling of responsibility, whether by the pseudo-scientific preaching up of materialistic determinism, or by the pseudo-religious proclamation of the all-overriding, despotic sovereignty of God, are inconsistent with the two foundations without which religion has no firm resting-place, I mean physical and mental science.

An intellectual and moral basis, then, it seems science may give to religion; or at least it may show that religion, even if otherwise acquired, is not destitute of such basis. But it cannot give the emotional basis, that feeling of love which transcends the feeling of obligation, and transfigures duty into delight.

And may we not go further, and say that, as mental and physical science cannot be allowed to teach discordantly from each other, so they cannot teach discordantly from any further revelation which God may be pleased to give? May not science justly postulate that no revelation can be inconsistent with the laws of science? And this brings me to the question of miracle. Miracles are constantly said to be inconsistent with science, because they are violations of scientific laws. But is this, indeed, the case? Are those who make this objection really aware of what they assume in making it? To be able to say with perfect certainty (and science only deals with certainties) that any given miracle is a violation of the laws of Nature, would involve a perfect knowledge of all the laws of Nature. For, otherwise, how could it be established that the miracle was not due to the intervention of some as yet unknown force, some directive power; not violating any known law, but simply conditioning its action?

Of such a force or power the human will is an excellent example. The alterations of natural conditions, *e.g.*, of climate, which have been produced upon this globe by man are familiar to everybody. And to what are they ultimately due but to that unknown, unknowable, and yet not for that less certain power, the human will? the action of which no one can discern, and yet no one in his senses practically questions? Is there not a close analogy here between the will of man and the will of God? between the activity of man and the activity of God? May not God act on his own handiwork through the laws He has established, and without the slightest violation of them, in a manner analogous to that in which man acts on creation through its laws, so as to produce results which, but for the intervention of the Divine will in the one case, and of the human will in the other, would not have taken place?

And this conception of Miracle as an exertion of the Divine will through laws known or unknown at

once removes miracle from the rubric of things opposed to science, and shows the absurdity of refusing to accept it unless it be reproducible by man at his own pleasure. "Resuscitate a corpse in a scientific laboratory, under the observation of scientific men," says M. Renan, "and repeat the feat as often as they shall demand its repetition, and I will believe in miracles." In other words, Reduce miracles from an exertion of Divine power to an exertion of human skill; make them irrelevant as testimony to any higher intervention, the very thing they were wrought for the purpose of exhibiting, and when they have thus ceased to be miracles I will accept them. But let it be once clearly seen that there need be nothing in a miracle outside the analogy between the Divine and the Human will and their respective operations, nothing therefore *anti-scientific*, and the supposed opposition between science and religion as regards miracles disappears.

Since then science itself postulates some will, some force, or whatever you choose to call it, outside the phenomenal universe, which has at least so distributed its final particles as to set it going, may we not further argue that the assertion that this will or force which confessedly has intervened in former time in a way to which the term "miracle" must be applied, now no longer intervenes, is strictly unscientific or even anti-scientific, because it assumes a break of continuity, and may we not say that science, in demanding *pre-historic* miracle, rather pronounces in favour of at least the probability of *historic* miracle?

The question then becomes simply one of *testimony*, coupled with those considerations of probability on the score of consistency and coherency which unbelievers, in slighting the miraculous, conveniently ignore.

When our Lord's career and character are estimated, the antecedent probability surely is that such a character is not only quite inconsistent with false pretensions to miraculous power, but is completely consistent with the possession of such power. His character in itself is a miracle: absolutely unique: impossible to invent: nothing less than a revelation of the Divine in human form. Is it improbable that Divine power should have accompanied Divine goodness? As, then, the character of Jesus is ascertained beyond all doubt,—no infidel, outside the slums, now questions it,—may it not be unscientific to reject the testimony which the very same history that attests His character *inseparably* gives to His acts?

And with regard to the last of these, His Resurrection, which is sometimes ascribed to the power of the Father, sometimes to His own power, sometimes apparently, to the Holy Spirit, it is to be carefully considered that its miraculous character is precisely analogous to that of the first miracle—the Creation. *They are both the first terms of a new series of existence.* They are not isolated, but germinal acts, involving consequences which grow directly out of them. The historic argument for the Resurrection of our Saviour, as it is not only stronger than that for any other miracle of His, so it is more directly analogous to that for the first miracle of all.

Thus it appears that there is a most real connection between science and religion. That nature and grace bear upon each other was clearly seen even in prescientific times. Kant said that two things struck him with astonishment and awe: the starry heavens above him and the moral law within him. The author of the

19th Psalm had said much the same thing in that singular ode in which from the beauty and grandeur of the heavens he goes on abruptly to sing the praises of the law of God. He already clearly saw the connection which the sage of Königsberg is celebrated for having pointed out, and which, strangely enough, the best Hebrew scholar of modern times, Prof. Ewald, so failed to discern, that he supposed the Psalm in question to be really two rolled into one by some clumsy syncretist!

And may we not trace a connection between religion and science even in a further department where it is little suspected? Science experiments; her laws are the results of experiment. Is it not the result of experiment, too, when men who have made trial of religion in its effect upon themselves, declare with one voice that having tasted and tried they have found the Lord to be gracious? The experiment has been made by millions who with one voice declare the same result: religion has upborne their minds through trials, and sorrows, and sufferings, and calamities; it has supported thousands and tens of thousands in the fiercest agonies that the ingenuity of persecution could devise. And this, observe, in accord with a system of morals entirely different from any of those other creeds which have likewise had their martyrs. Is no weight to be reasonably attached to such an experiment as this?

This is the argument that lies at the root of Paley's *Evidences*, a now almost forgotten book, but one the reasoning of which never has been answered. Paley does not indeed appeal to the inner experiences, the spiritual consolations, of the apostles and primitive believers, but his appeal to the historic grounds for belief, which they must have had, presupposes the existence and the truth of those inner experiences, since the facts of which they were historically convinced were only valuable as bearing on the inner life.

But science has also another bearing on religion. As there can be no real inconsistency between different revelations of God, the supposed revelations made in Scripture must always be checked and defined by the revelation He has made in Nature. Of the latter we possess a certainty that in the very nature of things we cannot have of the former. Whatever, therefore, is plainly inconsistent with *ascertained* (not hypothetical) scientific Truth must be rejected, or at least its statement must be accepted with such modifications as certain Truth requires. In other words, instead of judging science by the Bible, the Bible must be judged by science, reversing the process of the Inquisition in the case of Galileo.

It is to be noted that only in the Old Testament is this adjustment requisite, and that the words of our Lord and his apostles, in the former case without exception, in the latter with but one or two very slight exceptions, afford no instance of collision between scientific and revealed Truth. Whilst one expression of St. John, like the final words of the 102nd Psalm, exactly anticipates that end of the phenomenal Universe which science, too, anticipates: "The world passeth away and the desire thereof;" all the passions and emotions which "transmit the lamp of life," which carry on life as we now know it and which make it a scene of enjoyment as well as of sin, pass away; "but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." At the time when the apostle wrote, this "transiency of all things" made no part of the most prevalent philosophic schemes; it is instructive to observe that what inspiration dictated, science now confirms.

From the necessity of the adjustment I have been speaking of flows the same lesson which is indirectly taught by the saying concerning Christ that the Holy Spirit was given Him without measure. If He alone possessed it in that supreme degree, it may be expected that the inspiration of subordinate agents in the divine economy may require much allowance to be made for their mental peculiarities and imperfect illumination. For inspiration is dynamical, not mechanical; the sacred writers were not amanuenses; and its dynamics involve the factor of human imperfection. If science clearly, though indirectly, teaches this, who can say that she does not do religion most valuable service by thus leading us from the worship of the letter to that of the spirit?

One word more permit me on the subject of evolution, which has been prominent in your auditor's address. Like fire, evolution is a good servant, but a bad master. Pressed beyond what seems to be the scientific ground for accepting it, viewed as the *cause* and not merely as the *method* of creation, it tends to put God out of sight, by substituting for that continuous action of his which is asserted by our Lord, a tentative process which the geological record does not confirm, and for which the most recent conclusions of physical astronomy refuse the necessary time. But taken in that sense in which I heard it expounded with marvellous lucidity last year at Cambridge in the Reede Lecture by Professor Huxley, in which natural selection and the survival of the fittest were not even mentioned as *instruments*, far less as *causes*, taken as giving merely the *method*, the *lines* of the divine procedure, there is nothing whatever inconsistent with religion in it. Nay, it seems to harmonise with those words of our Lord, to which I have already alluded, much better than does the usual conception of creation. "My Father is ever working from all past time till now" said Jesus, in order to justify Himself for breaking the Sabbath by doing likewise. A more exact description of that continuous unresting activity which is asserted by the evolution-hypothesis, stripped of its accretions, could not be given. But without the Divine Mind working, the hypothesis is powerless. It cannot explain the origin of order or of life, it does not explain the origin of man. The attempts made by some theorists in that direction, who have, as the auditor justly observed, out-Darwined Darwin, are simply ludicrous, and may be taken as warnings not to allow the mind to be carried off its balance by loving theory more than truth.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

OVERCROWDING OF THE POOR.

SIR,—I observe with pleasure your remarks on letters written to you on certain social subjects. People write as if because England is (or seems to them) over-peopled, therefore the world is. There are two fallacies under this set of notions. One is that poverty and misery are the effect of dense peopling; the other, that this dense peopling is an evil to be put right by suppression. Poverty was more intense in England during the forty years at the beginning of this century than during the second forty years of the same, and population was not more than

two-thirds, if the middle years of each period be taken. As for the second fallacy, any attempt to put down natural increase by unnatural means must result in evil. Any Englishman who desires to see our social condition assimilated to that of France is a victim of delusions and is not to be argued with.

The key to this social question is to be found in the twenty-eighth verse of the first chapter of Genesis: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." There are here four injunctions. If the first three are attended to, and the last not, the command is neglected. If the first two are attended to, and the last not, the command is disobeyed. If the first only is attended to, and the other three not, the command is set at defiance. I begin with the last clause, "Subdue the earth." That is, cultivate it, and make it produce all the food and other necessities that it can. What a violation of this means was exemplified in Ireland during the beginning of this century, when the land was devoted to the raising of nothing but potatoes, the lowest class of food. The potatoes wore out, as things will and must do if subjected to forcing, and that people who were fruitful and multiplied, and replenished (not the earth but) a portion of the earth, and neglected to subdue it, were subdued by it. Next, the penultimate clause. Any nation that is fruitful and multiplies, but neglects to replenish and subdue the earth, will be in a chronic state of poverty, and under chronic danger of famine; witness the thickly peopled parts of Hindostan, from which the people never emigrate. The coolies do not come from Bengal, but from Bombay provinces, which are much more thinly inhabited. And witness Ireland till emigration began. The last case of disobedience to the command is child murder. If a people is fruitful, but does not want to multiply, this is the remedy it takes, a truly diabolical one.

Now our social reformers who are frightened at over-population advise, instead of obedience to the whole command of God, the first command He ever issued; the command, to carry out which was the first duty of the human race, and the diligent obedience to which must bring a blessing; our social reformers recommend, because it is not all carried out, to carry out none of it; to set it aside and disobey it in all its parts. How much wiser they are than their Creator! Let them have their way in England, and England will soon be lower, morally at first, and then intellectually and then politically, than France. "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." I have often thought that our Lord meant the commonwealth of England by this, and I am sure that, whether I am right or wrong in this, it will do me, and all Englishmen, no harm to think so. But if we refuse to bring forth any fruit, and refuse to go on with the work of replenishing and subduing the earth, which work began at the time when our nation was set free in the sixteenth century, and which has proceeded at increased speed during each succeeding century, certainly we shall deserve to have our candlestick removed from its place.

This is a most concerning subject, in all its branches. Next week I hope to address to you a few words on the subject of "rookeries." B.

1st December, 1884.

SIR,—While thanking Mr. Charpentier and Mrs. Stuart for their letters, will you kindly allow me space for one explanation and one remark? I do *not* pro-

pose any "direct means for the prevention of large families;" if my letter seemed to convey that meaning, I regret that it was not better expressed; and as for "Mr. Bradlaugh's devices," if they are of the nature I am informed they are, I cannot speak against them with strong enough abhorrence.

I do not believe in "prevention." I want to put before the people a higher, and therefore more truly religious, ideal. For whether is better, for a married couple to say—We have now that number of children which our means will allow us to bring up decently, and with due regard to the requirements of their minds and souls as well as merely of their bodies, and we will therefore refrain; or for a married couple to go on, as Mrs. Stuart expresses it, "bringing into the world any number of children, utterly regardless of all consideration as to how they are to be fed, clothed, educated, and started in life?"

Of course I am aware that this *may* be so taught as to produce immorality, so *may* the doctrine of justification by faith as to produce Antinomianism, but that is no argument against right teaching.

GEO. BLADON.

Penwortham, 1st December, 1884.

[We are glad to print this explanation by Mr. Bladon, and we hope that he will withdraw his heedless criticism on our truthful and beautiful Marriage Service. We have received numerous letters thanking us for advocating natural duties and early marriages, and repudiating the injurious and beastly outrages on nature, which, we regret to say, are now much practised, although they are reprobated by St. Paul and all truly Christian writers. Our correspondent "B," a high authority on Political Economy, points out the way of health, happiness, morality, and, as we believe, true and lasting prosperity in this important duty.—ED.]

CLEANLINESS NEXT TO GODLINESS.

SIR,—Referring to the ceremonial regulations laid down by Moses for the preservation of health, Sir Robert Rawlinson, at the Congress of the Sanitary Institute, made an important if not a startling statement. He mentioned how certain of the purifications enjoined in Leviticus may with advantage be adopted by Christian communities in all countries, inasmuch as "there are at this day what may be termed leprous sites, upon which stand leprous-tainted houses." Moreover, he averred that "something akin to leprosy" exists in our great towns, and particularly in London, and that this malignant and deadly type of disease is recognised by hospital surgeons. That the Jews were not a particularly cleanly people the Levitical laws clearly indicate. Yet in some respects they were far in advance of ourselves. Look what we are doing in the great capital of the British Empire in this enlightened age, and in the most affluent city in the world! We are complacently suffering the enormous annual mortality of the metropolis to be stowed away anyhow in the few London cemeteries at our command. Millions of bodies lie rotting and putrifying in those pestilential places, and yet how seldom are voices raised against the irreverent, obnoxious, and dangerous practice of burying the dead among the living? Warnings, it is true, are from time to time given. But such pass unheeded with the unthinking majority, while the governments and legislatures of the day have had

and appear still to have more urgent matters to engage their attention. When social politics will become the politics of the future, a change must assuredly come. Meanwhile the health and lives of the community must remain in jeopardy. The Jews, by their laws, were not suffered to inter their dead in cities, a sanitary rule wisely adopted in some countries of Europe at this day.

Sir Robert Rawlinson pointed out that in mediæval times Christianity became answerable for an insanitary practice which, once permitted, became general. "Burials of the dead," he stated, "took place in churchyards and within churches, in the subsoil and in vaults, to an extent which seemed almost incredible." Not only were burial grounds raised by old coffins and human bones several feet in height above the original level, "but within the body of these churches vaults were constructed and coffins piled tier above tier until the lower *stratum* had been crushed by the weight above, and the vault floor had become covered with a mass of putrid human remains." This form of earth-pollution has not been removed wholly by the Burials Act passed by Lord Palmerston. It has only been diminished. Although sanitary matters may not be quite as bad now as when every London parish had its churchyard, nevertheless they are quite bad enough, and, if the *Lancet* carries any weight, possibly go far enough to account for a vast deal of the irrepressible contagion that exists in our midst, and even that "something akin to leprosy" which hospital physicians are said to "recognise."

The slow decomposition of bodies buried in strong coffins and in town cemeteries is known to give off "pestilential miasmata which poison neighbouring populations," to reproduce the language of M. Kachlin-Schwartz, an eminent foreign scientist. Who can tell to what degree the residents of the metropolis suffer from a cause so active and potent?

What we sorely need is a radical change generally in our method of burial. We need to come back to Nature's fashion and the system in vogue in this country before the undertaker's imperishable coffins were introduced—an evil day certainly! The earth-to-earth mode of treating the dead is innocuous. This is testified by high medical and scientific authority, and is practically proved to be so at the London Necropolis, Surrey, where it has been carried out since the time of Mr. Seymour Haden's advocacy of the principle in the *Times*. Singular to say that while numerous voices are raised against cremation, not a whisper is heard against inhumation after this plan. "There is nothing," remarks the *Times*, "needlessly revolting in the process of interment which Mr. Haden suggests. Custom is a great influence, and 'earth to earth' are words with which we have been so long familiar, that we do not shrink from what they describe as we do from the application of other agencies which Science—and, as it would appear, mistaken science—has been vainly pressing upon us to adopt." We may not be able to realise a city of Hygiene as some sanguine scientists dream of. We may do something towards such a sanitary blessing, however. And one way of effecting this is to arrest the further pollution of the London soil, and to bury our dead away from masses of human life, and after the old and natural pattern of committing earth to earth, in harmony with the Divine sanction.

CLERICUS.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—In my letter of October 25th I pointed out, as an important consideration for determining the approximate date of our present Canonical Gospels, the fact of the existence of a MS. tradition forming the groundwork of the Synoptists. That groundwork has been naturally called the “common triple tradition.” It manifests itself not only in what sequence of *logia* and *anecdota* the first three Gospels have in common, but, more particularly, in the identity of the more important words, which appears even where the sequence of paragraphs is broken. This is so manifest that it has been hitherto a fruitful subject of debate which was the copier and which the copied among the Evangelists. That idea is now being abandoned. Their many discrepancies, disagreements, variations, transpositions, and insertions forbid it. It does not accord with common sense nor with honesty that Greek converts like Mark or Luke, with the Gospel of Matthew before them, should presume to alter and recast it with various omissions, restatements, and additions. It would be an impertinence in secular matters; in spiritual matters it is far worse. The idea, therefore, is discarded. The three Gospels are thus independent. What similarity and identity exist, arise from the common MS. tradition which they embodied. If, further, the Gospels be examined from this point of view, it will appear that this common tradition, though substantially the same for all three, was not absolutely identical in form, and still less so in the arrangement of its sections. We may, therefore, regard that common tradition as existing originally in loose, unsorted fragments, and slightly varying in form. As such, they would be found in different Greek Christian Churches. To them, probably, as well as to other floating traditions, the author of the third Gospel alludes when he would give his friend Theophilus the benefit of his digest of Gospel certainties. Besides this common basis, he appears to have used two other traditional sources, the one probably Aramaic, if we may judge from the style of the Greek of the first two chapters, and the other, consisting of about eight chapters, reproducing *logia* and parables not found in the other Evangelists. We may trace, therefore, three sources at least of tradition in Luke’s Gospel. This is in harmony, too, with the *exordium*, and is as near a certainty as we can arrive at. Moreover, this criticism of the third Gospel is supported by critical investigation into the first. The Rev. S. Baring Gould, whose orthodoxy has never been questioned, wrote ten years ago an interesting chapter on “The Lost Petrine Gospels.” For his arguments I refer your readers to the work itself, but his conclusion is that Matthew’s Greek Gospel reveals “four sources whence it was drawn,” the two chief ones being the *logia* of the Apostle Matthew, written originally in Aramaic, and the common tradition used afterwards by Mark. Assuming the substantial truth of this criticism we have two out of the three Synoptic Gospels composed of digests of various Christian traditions, while Mark knows only the more widely circulated “triple tradition.” This theory of the origin of our present Gospels, if accepted, has the advantage of substantiating their general truthfulness by pointing among others to one tradition widely known and therefore of early Christian date, when the Gospels were compiled; further, it does away with that terrible *crux* of theologians, the parent of many a desperate and

deplorable shift, one that made the great Origen giddy to think of, viz., the obligation to form a satisfactory harmony of the Gospels. This theory, too, is not without the sanction of our Church, in the person of Bishop Marsh.

Now if the Synoptic Gospels were compiled in the manner suggested, it appears probable that they passed through more than one form of collection, before they reached their present shape. The Rev. Baring Gould is even of opinion that the Gospel of Marcion was founded upon an earlier edition of Luke’s Gospel. Whether right or wrong, certain it is that we have in lost Petrine and Pauline Gospels parts of our Canonical ones embedded. The recently recovered *Διδαχὴ* exhibits a collection of its own. It seems most natural that the earliest Christian churches, consisting chiefly of the poor and the illiterate, should be satisfied at first with the preached word. This would probably last as long as their first preachers were alive. Paul nowhere mentions in his Epistles the providing of congregations with the written word. No allusion is made to written Gospels. When he says, “according to my Gospel,” he means the preached word. His converts were “to remember the words of the Lord Jesus.” His scripture was the LXX. The first Apostolic council did not broach the question. The Book of Acts does not refer to any written Gospel in use. In the tradition of the composition of Mark’s Gospel, it is significant that “when Peter knew, he neither forbade nor encouraged it” (Clement of Alexandria). Josephus, who was born four years after the crucifixion, and who lived more than thirty years in Jerusalem and Galilee, is perfectly silent about them. Like another Jewish historian of that period, Justus of Tiberias, he does not make the smallest reference to anything Christian. A late epistle (2 Peter), admitted into the Canon, refers generally to the Gospels as “the other Scriptures.” “*Erigena*” questions its genuineness, and I will not dispute the point. It would, indeed, seem to be of later date than some of the patristic writings (110-130 A.D.), which quote no Gospel by name, and which mix authentic Gospel sayings with traditional or apocryphal ones indiscriminately. Justin Martyr, past the middle of the second century, knew not the Gospels by name, but only as the “Memoirs of the Apostles.” The same phenomenon appears in the Clementine Homilies (150-170 A.D.). Not before Irenæus, a Gallican Bishop (177-202 A.D.), is the authorship of the respective Gospels assigned by name. Throughout this century and a half, from the crucifixion to Irenæus, we may, if unprejudiced, trace normal growth and silent development. The same law, which is now traced in other spheres of nature and of humanity, was present here also. As the first Apostles passed away; as the destruction of Jerusalem dispersed the early Jewish Christian Church, and the *fulcrum* of Christianity gradually passed from Judaism, with its Aramaic language, to the Gentiles with their new language and new mental activities; while tradition was losing in distinctness in proportion to its distance from its source, the first MSS., probably of the “common tradition,” appeared. As no rule is without an exception, we must make one for the fivefold *logia* of the Apostle Matthew in Aramaic. But this work, probably from the fact of its composition in Aramaic, was less known, evidently, than the “common tradition.” When these “common tradition” MSS. increased and began to diverge

through faulty transcription and variant local additions, the acquisitions of each church would vary in proportion to the growth in doctrine and ritual, and, certainly, to the intelligence of its members. There is tolerably good proof of this. The Jews earnestly desired a Messiah descended from David; accordingly Matthew obliged them in his Gospel (Irenæus). The Nazarenes and Ebionites used a "Gospel of the Hebrews" (Jerome). The Church of Rhosias in Cilicia, as late as the end of the second century, used a "Gospel of Peter," which Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, first approved of and then suppressed (Eusebius). The Church of Sinope had the "Gospel of the Lord." Other Gospels, apocryphal indeed, but not necessarily dishonest, were in use in various other churches. Some of these, like the Gospels of Thomas, of Philip, of James the Less, and of Nicodemus were, according to a widely prevalent custom among the Jews, attributed to Apostles and their associates. All these, embodying much apocryphal tradition, were in use in different churches, even so late as the third century of our era. They all appeared in answer to some want. As Polycarp says, in his Epistle to the Philipians, "He did not write to them of his own impulse, but at their instigation." So with the Gospel records. They supplied a want in Christian communities. But I must defer the conclusion of these considerations for another week.

F. T. P.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE RELATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE." The Bampton Lectures, 1884. By the Right Rev. Frederick, Lord Bishop of Exeter. London. Macmillan and Co., 1884. Pp. 252.

"WEATHERCOCKS AND WINDS OF DOCTRINE." London. Elliot Stock. Pp. 24.

WE notice the above pamphlet with the Bishop of Exeter's Bampton Lectures, because, although the titles do not show it, the subject matter of the two is exactly the same. And if in our remarks we deal mainly with the Bishop's book, we must not be supposed to ignore the other, which is not only well written, but has also the unusual merit of stating fairly the sceptic's standpoint, and not merely setting up a man of straw, built but to be burnt. Unlike many preceding "Bampton Lectures," the Bishop of Exeter's volume is not an answer to anybody in particular; but is exactly what its title describes it—a statement of the relations between religion and science. Too often that relationship is thought, or rather taken for granted, to be antagonistic, pure, and simple. Sometimes the relationship is made an identity, so that it is said that science to the scientific man is religion; sometimes again the relationship is considered so distant that practically there is none; but if we have understood the Bishop's book aright he would say that science and revelation are both doctrines of God which do not and cannot come into collision at all, since they really look both in the same direction, only through different *media*. The *medium* through which science sees God is law and order in the phenomena of Nature—for beyond phenomena science does not rightly go—and its universal postulate is the uniformity of Nature; but the *medium* in Revelation is conscience, and the primary evidence

that a Revelation is from God is its harmony with conscience. Speaking generally, the Bishop deals with two apparent difficulties. "Science and Religion," he says, "come into apparent collision on the question of the freedom of the will. Science and Religion come into a similar apparent collision on the possibility of miracles. The cases are precisely parallel. In each individual man the uniformity of Nature is broken to leave room for the moral force of the will to assert its independent existence." It is on the second of these two "apparent collisions" that we would venture to make a suggestion. It is crying aloud in the wilderness, we know; and our suggestion will not be adopted, but for all that we heartily wish that meaningless, useless, and altogether objectionable word "miracle" were utterly abolished from all controversy—abolished, indeed, if possible, altogether.

That word abolished, numberless controversies would cease, and much that seems dark, would have light thrown on it. For a miracle strictly means something wonderful—just such a thing as the Jews wished our Saviour to do and He would not—His works were "signs." And then, whensoever the order and regularity of the working of Nature's law is interfered with, or if the evidence that it ever has been be admitted to be sufficient, the question becomes very simple. First, is the interference real or only seeming? If the latter, then the matter is ended. But if the former, then such interference must be a "sign."

It may be only the sign that some higher law is operating. "The miraculous healing of the sick," says the Bishop (p. 195), "may be but an instance of the power of mind over body, a power which is not yet brought within the range of science, and which nevertheless may be really within its domain. In other ways what seems to be miraculous may be simply unusual."

Now if only for such popular, misleading words as "miracle," "miraculous," etc., the correct and therefore more truly scientific words "sign," "significant," etc., were used,—notice that St. John *always* uses the word *σημεῖον*—how much clearer all this would be. When there is a real interference with that orderly sequence of cause and effect which we call law, then in every case it is a "sign." But the interference may be only of human will,—it may be only like "the power of mind over body." But on the other hand such interference may be "significant" of more than merely this, that is, the power of the human will may not be sufficient to account for the event. If so, the believer, the truly scientific man, who regards the facts both of nature and Revelation, is in no difficulty, but the pseudo-scientist is. He must necessarily be reduced to denying (as some have denied) the possibility of any "sign" either of human interference or of interference more than human. He is compelled to teach (as some do teach) that the universe is but a self-made and self-wound-up machine, and man but a figure which comes out and per forms. Let those believe it who can.

THE first proceedings of the Salvation Army at Cambridge have been marked by a disturbance which was very disgraceful; the meeting in Alexandra Hall, which was intended for University men, was much disturbed and eventually broken up, and the unruly undergraduates were only prevented by the

judicious use of a fire hose from invading the Town meeting in Sturton Town-hall. The proctors are using their authority to put a stop to the meetings of the Army. Two years ago, when there was some disturbance at one of Messrs. Moody and Sankey's meetings, the real earnestness of the proceedings put the rowdies to shame; but it might be risky to trust to a similar influence in the present case.

LORD RAYLEIGH will cease to hold the Cavendish Professorship of Experimental Physics in the University of Cambridge at the end of this term. There is a good deal of gossip afloat as to the question who is to succeed him. A very largely signed memorial was presented to Sir William Thomson, of Peterhouse, asking him to be a candidate, but he has declined to leave Glasgow. It is said that pressure has been put on Professor Stokes to exchange his present post for the work at the Cavendish Laboratory; but it seems very doubtful whether he will accede to this proposal. Should it be left open for younger men, Dr. Schuster, of St. John's, would be a strong candidate from Manchester; and among residents Mr. Glazebrook, of Trinity, who has been working constantly at the Laboratory as the Demonstrator and Lecturer for several years, and Mr. J. J. Thomson, of Trinity, would be likely to come forward.

THE Preachers in the Chapel Royal, Savoy, for the present month are as follows:—7th, the Rev. Henry White, the Rev. J. Lindsay, rector of St. Clement Danes. 14th, the Rev. Dr. Forrest, vicar of St. Jude's, Kensington, Canon Protheroe. 21st, the Rev. Henry White, the Rev. A. G. Bowman, vicar of St. Andrew's, Westminster. 25th (Christmas Day), the Rev. Henry White.

A COURSE of Advent lectures will be preached at St. Alphage, London Wall, on Friday evenings, the 5th, 12th, and 19th inst., at eight o'clock, by the Rev. W. Barker, rector of St. Marylebone, the Bishop of Bedford, and Prebendary Whittington, rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill. After the last service some carols will be sung by the choir. Young Men are invited to attend.

AT Oxford Cathedral sermons will be preached on Wednesday evenings in Advent by the Rev. N. T. Garry, of St. Mary's, Reading, Archdeacon Pott, and Archdeacon Randall.

AT Westminster Abbey the preachers for December will be:—7th—morning, at 10, the Rev. H. Aldrich Cotton. 14th—the Rev. J. Macarthur, vicar of Lamplugh. 21st—the Rev. Dr. Troutbeck. Christmas Day, 25th—at 10, the Dean. St. Stephen, 26th—at 3, Canon Furse. St. John's (on Eve of Innocents), 27th—at 3, the Dean to children. Sunday, 28th—at 10, the Rev. R. Bernard, vicar of Selborne. Canon Furse, as Canon-in-Residence, will preach each Sunday in December at the 3 p.m. service. We publish the names of the evening preachers last week.

AT the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, the preachers for this month will be:—December 7th—morning, the Rev. G. W. Daniell; afternoon, the Rev. W. Hulton. 14th—morning and afternoon, the Rev. W. W. Merry (in aid of the Parochial Mission Women Society). 21st—morning, the Rev. W. F. Erskine Knollys; afternoon, the Sub-Dean. Christmas Day—the Rev. W. Hulton. 28th—morning and afternoon, the Rev. W. W. Merry.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Aldridge, Rev. William Wheeler, Rural Dean of Burnham District, in the Deanery of Axbidge.
 Bruce, Rev. W. S., Rector of St. John-the-Baptist, Bristol; Vicar of South Petherton.
 Chaplin, Rev. William, Curate-in-Charge of York Street Mission, St. Helens; Incumbent of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Liverpool.
 Coates, Rev. A. L., M.A., Minor Canon; Precentor of Rochester Cathedral.
 Dew, Rev. George Platt, B.A., Rector of Wolvesnewton; Rector of Kilgwrrwg, Monmouthshire.
 Dixon, Rev. Frederic Arthur, B.A., Vicar of Chilthorne Damer.
 Eden, Rev. Robert A., Rector of Barnes, Surrey.
 Goodford, Rev. Montagu Charles, M.A., Rector of Chilton Cantelo and Ashington.
 Grant, Rev. Charles, Vicar of St. Benedict's, Glastonbury.
 Greatorex, Rev. Edward, Rector of Croxdale and Minor Canon; Precentor of Durham Cathedral.
 Grimston, Rev. Alexander, M.A., Vicar of Lund-with-Kilnwick; Vicar of Stillingfleet, York.
 Harding, Rev. John Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Rockfield, Monmouthshire; Rural Dean of Eastern Division of Abergavenny Deanery.
 Harrison, Rev. Frank, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Holy Trinity, Hulme.
 Headley, Rev. Alexander Arthur, Vicar of Portchester, Hants.
 Hervey, Rev. James Arthur, B.A., Vicar of Nynehead.
 Hogg, Rev. Christopher Haynes, B.A., Chaplain of the Metropolitan Asylum Hospital at Plaistow.
 How, Rev. Frederick Douglas, M.A., Rector of Evershot, Dorchester; Vicar of St. James's, Edgbaston.
 Leach, Rev. John William, T.A., Vicar of Broomfield.
 Mather, Rev. F. A., Rector of Minchinhampton, near Stroud.
 Nicholson, Rev. Richard, Rector of Beechingstoke; Vicar of Wincanton.
 Osborn, Rev. Montagu Francis Finch, M.A., Vicar of Embleton.
 Palmer, Rev. H. J., M.A., Head Master of Clare Mount School, Wallasey; Vicar of Christ Church, Ashton-under-Lyne.
 Rowley, Rev. William Walter, M.A., Rural Dean of the Deanery of Pawlett.
 Searth, Rev. Harry Mengden, M.A., Rural Dean of the District of Portishead, in the Deanery of Chew.
 Shackleton, Rev. Matthew, Vicar of Wincanton; Rector of Beechingstoke.
 Trotter, Rev. Edward Bush, M.A., Vicar of Alnwick; Honorary Canon of Newcastle.
 Welby, Rev. Montague Earle, M.A., Vicar of Llanlleonvel, Brecon; Rector of Gilestone, Glamorganshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Aston, Rev. John A., Vicar of St. John's, Deptford, late Vicar of St. Luke's, Cheltenham, at St. John's Vicarage, on the 26th ult., aged 57.
 Browne, Very Rev. the Hon. Henry Montague, Dean of Lisamore, second son of the second Baron Kilmaine, at Bredon Rectory, Worcestershire, on the 24th ult., aged 85.
 Clutterbuck, Rev. Charles Francis, at Ozeleworth Rectory, Gloucestershire, suddenly, on the 29th ult., aged 58.
 Edwards, Rev. Edward James Justinian George, since 1836 Curate and Incumbent of Trentham, Staffordshire, and Prebendary of Lichfield, at 34, York Terrace, on the 27th ult., in the 73rd year of his age.
 Girdlestone, Rev. Francis G., at Landford Rectory, Wilts., on the 28th ult., aged 51.
 Lane, Rev. Charles H., M.A., Assistant-Master and Bursar of Wellington College, on the 29th ult., aged 38.
 Madden, Rev. James Arnold Wycliffe, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford, youngest son of the late Sir F. Madden, K.H., F.R.S., at Erlsmere, Dickoya, Ceylon, on the 13th ult., aged 34.
 Palmer, Rev. Charles Edwin, Vicar of West Hartlepool, at his residence, the Vicarage, on the 25th ult., aged 62.
 Shuldham, Rev. John, late Rector of Wood Norton and Swanton Novers, Norfolk, on the 23rd ult., aged 90.
 Welby, Rev. Arthur Earle, Rector of Holy Trinity, Hulme, Manchester, youngest son of the late Sir W. E. Welby, Bart., at Cheltenham, on the 26th ult., aged 69.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ON THE PERSONALITY OF THE EVIL ONE.

BY THE VENERABLE J. P. NORRIS, D.D., ARCH-DEACON OF BRISTOL.

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY, AT THE MORNING SERVICE, ON THE TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, 1884.

"Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil."
—EPHESIANS VI. 10, 11.

TO-DAY'S Epistle is one of those passages of Scripture that lay hold upon our imagination in childhood and are never forgotten. St. Paul might, in dry phrase, have inculcated these several duties, of truthfulness, righteousness, faith, hope, and the rest. But he preferred to present them to the mind's eye as in a picture. And herein he was but following the example of his Lord and Master; only with this difference, that Christ's pictures were mostly Parables, St. Paul's were Allegories. An allegory is an assemblage of metaphors. In the allegory before us you will find these duties pictured forth in six separate metaphors—words, that is, diverted from their ordinary meaning to denote something moral or spiritual. Thus here the girdle is made to denote truthfulness; the breastplate, righteousness; the sandals, activity in preaching the Gospel; the shield, faith; the helmet, hope; the sword, God's word.

Now it were vain in a single sermon to consider this passage in detail. These six several metaphors might well supply texts for six several sermons. To-day we will take the passage as a whole; and among the many lessons that might be drawn from it, select this one, which is surely a most important lesson, *the personal character of our warfare*.

Or let us unfold it a little more:—Our foe is personal and superhuman, that first; and secondly, to prevail against him we must draw our strength from ONE who is also personal and superhuman, and mightier than he.

Both these truths seem to me important, and especially important to us; for is there not a tendency in our age to forget these truths? Or at any rate a tendency in our popular literature and common talk to keep these truths out of sight? A thousand busy tongues or pens tell us that there is going on, all around us and among us, a conflict between good and evil. But when they

come to specify, what is the evil? "It is crime," men say, "it is ignorance," "it is vice," and so on. And what is the remedy? "It is good government," "it is education," "it is diffusion of healthier tastes," and the like. True answers as far as they go, but misleading if they blind us to the master-truth, that as behind all these social evils there is a personal malignant enemy, so over and above all these social reforms there must be faith in a personal Redeemer. And this is precisely what public opinion (as we phrase it) is apt to ignore. Oh my brethren, believe me, he who ceases to believe the reality of the Evil One will ere long be losing his faith in a personal Saviour. Ere it be too late, then, listen to St. Paul:—"We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." I give his language in our Revised Version. His meaning is plain:—"Our struggle is not against men, but against evil angels of every degree, against the powers of darkness, against wicked spirits who, for aught we know, people the air around us." "A Hebraism," it may be said, "Jewish modes of thought, familiar to those whom he was addressing; and therefore used by St. Paul by way of accommodation." So modern talk and modern writers try to explain away these inspired assertions that our real enemy is a personal evil spirit, who, all unseen, is contriving, organising, strengthening, prompting, impelling, directing, all these dangerous influences that menace the well-being of society.

Before we consent thus to reject St. Paul's plain statements, it may be well to consider that we shall also have to explain away equally clear declarations of our blessed Lord. Let two suffice out of very many: "He," the devil, "was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." (John viii. 44.) And again, "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." (John xii. 31.) We shall have to explain away also and get rid of the deeply comforting Scriptures that tell us Christ can be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," because He "was in all points tempted like as we are," though without sin. For if our Lord was tempted, the temptation must have come from without. To suppose the temptation to have come from within would be a horrible blasphemy. It came therefore from without; and as it came upon Him most powerfully in His hours of solitude,—in the wilderness, in Gethsemane, it came from some unseen spirit who could then approach Him, whom He Himself mysteriously called a "power of darkness" and "the prince of this world." "The Prince of this world cometh," He said in the upper chamber.

And another consideration I would suggest drawn from our own consciousness. I would appeal to all who have felt temptation to bad thoughts in moments of solitude, to say whether there has not been a strange malignity in the manner and time chosen for the temptation, a malignity as of a personal fiend, holding aloof for hours, and then, when we have been kneeling perhaps to say our prayers, suddenly assailing us, suggesting thoughts that no mere association of ideas could possibly account for.

Or again, and this I would, in the last place, specially urge:—think of the inexpressible comfort of being allowed to believe that such wicked thoughts are not self-originated! What deep comfort, and what bright hope of redemption, if “an enemy have done this!” For all Scripture with one consent voice proclaims that this power of the tempter is only by permission and for a limited time.

For all these reasons—because of the consistent testimony of Scripture—because you cannot tear it out of Scripture without mutilating almost all its revelations; because Christ’s temptation is otherwise inexplicable; and most of all because it is essential when we come to think of it to the very conception of a Redeemer; I would entreat any who may have had their belief in the personality of the Evil One shaken, to consider how many other beliefs which they would not lose for all the world, may haply go with it.

And now the last point, the connexion of this belief in a personal enemy with our belief in a personal Redeemer, leads on to the second part of our subject: “If our foe be personal, superhuman, and mighty, then no strength of our own will avail against him, we must draw our strength from One who is also a Person and superhuman, and yet mightier than our foe”—the armour which the Christian takes unto himself must be the armour of God.

What St. Paul means by its being “the armour of God” will appear at once if we briefly consider St. Paul’s enumeration of its several parts. Four of the six will at any rate be seen to be essentially connected with God’s scheme of salvation in Christ.

The first and second may at first sight seem to belong by no means exclusively to the Christian, but to the upright heathen as much as to the Christian. And this is in itself instructive, showing how in St. Paul’s view the whole world is God’s world, and all mankind in one sense His children. The righteousness which must be the breast-plate of all, the truthfulness which like a girdle is to prevent them tripping to their fall in the race of life, must come from God. And yet is it no less true, and we shall one day understand it, that whatever righteousness, whatever truthfulness, men attained in old days, or now attain beyond the confines of Christendom, is attained through Him

who is “the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”

But let us pass on, and consider the four latter parts of the armour, and how they evidently connect themselves with Christ. Daily had St. Paul in that captivity from which he wrote, watched the soldier to whom he was chained accoutre himself when he rose from his pallet. After he had girded his tunic and clasped on his breast-plate, what next? Four things were yet needed: the sandals for the feet, the shield for the left arm, the helmet for the head, the sword for the right hand.

And so for the Christian: there must be preparedness to carry the glad tidings of peace wherever his Master may send him; the “glad tidings of peace” observe—that is, of Christ who is our Peace; there must be over all the protecting shield of faith; and if St. Paul had been asked what he here meant by faith, can we doubt his answer: “faith in the Lord Jesus Christ?” There must be the good hope of salvation which like a helmet will enable him to lift up his head without fear in his conflict with evil; not hopefulness merely, but a definite hope, the hope of salvation, hope in a personal Saviour. There must be, lastly, the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God—the only offensive weapon allowed to the Christian, drawn straight from the armoury of Christ.

Whatever, then, may be the modern and more popular view, that our only defences against the evil around us are to be found in education, good government, applied science, and the like—this is not St. Paul’s view. The Gospel of Christ, Faith in Christ, Hope in Christ, the Words of Christ,—without these we can never hope to be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might; without these we can never expect to stand against the wiles of our personal enemy, and having done all to stand!

And now, my friends, in conclusion, think what it would be to us if we more habitually had present to our minds the thought of a personal Lord and Saviour. In all our other hopes and fears, it is not to dead laws, or systems of morality, or principles of action, but to the personal influence, to the guiding hand, the living voice, of this or that schoolmaster, leader, friend, parent, that we look. And if it may be so, no less, in the most momentous issues of our life, shall we lightly surrender this faith—the faith that has sustained the noblest and bravest, the holiest and most lovely, of whom history holds record—the faith that in all our dangers we may turn to One within the veil, as near to us as our own soul, though all unseen; One who in His own Person has explored all the infirmities of our nature, able therefore to sympathise, able to succour to the uttermost; the faith that in all our trials, in the trials of the child no less than in the hottest furnace of God’s persecuted saints, there stands by our side One whose form is the

gracious form of the Son of God.* Oh, my friends, if this blessed faith were ours more habitually, how it would strengthen us to withstand in the evil day, and, having done all to complete our panoply, to stand undismayed before the foe!

——
IN MEMORIAM—14TH DECEMBER, 1861.

BY THE REV. THOMAS MILLER DICKSON, M.A., FORMERLY SENIOR SCHOLAR OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, SECOND MASTER OF MARLBOROUGH SCHOOL, AND CURATE IN SOLE CHARGE OF ST. GILES'S AND ST. PETER'S, CAMBRIDGE, NOW HEAD MASTER OF THE PREPARATORY SCHOOL, CLAUGHTON, BIRKENHEAD.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. GILES'S, CAMBRIDGE, ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 22ND, 1861, BEING THE DAY BEFORE THE FUNERAL OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE CONSORT.

"And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day: and I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation; and I will bring up sackcloth upon all loins, and baldness upon every head; and I will make it as the mourning of an only son, and the end thereof as a bitter day."—AMOS viii. 9 and 10.

IT is no common event, no ordinary calamity, that has awakened the sympathy and sorrow of the nation, and caused us to feel applicable in their fullest extent the direful words of our text, "It shall come to pass, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day; and I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation."

We are here this day to mourn, not to murmur, to bewail a bereavement such as rarely occurs, from the pre-eminent worth of the deceased, but not to question the right or impeach the wisdom or the goodness of his God and ours, who has called our beloved Prince so early from his faithful labours on earth to the rest and blessedness of Heaven. We admit that the ways of God are mysterious, and that events like this startle our apprehensive fears and reverse our most cherished anticipations. But though clouds and darkness are round about Him, though "our sun has gone down at noon, and our feasts have been turned into mourning," who shall gainsay the Lord or dare to murmur at our God? Heavy indeed is the calamity that hath befallen us. We are well nigh stunned by the blow. We scarcely perceive anything but loss and disaster in the event, and under these impressions we now deplore it, and long shall continue to deplore our loss. But our righteous Father views the entire condition and circumstances both of the individual and of the community in all possible relations, contingencies, and consequences, and in

working all things after the counsel of His own will He errs not, He commits no iniquity. We therefore, in estimating divine dispensations, should endeavour to view them comprehensively, calmly, and dispassionately, and not only take into account what may and must be felt as calamitous and afflictive, in this overwhelming bereavement, by which the living voice so familiar and so eloquent is hushed in the deep unbroken silence of the grave, the light in which we rejoiced is extinguished, and the invaluable labours, by which we were benefited and blessed, cease for ever here on earth. But, also, we must consider how long and how brightly that light has shone, and how numerous and how rich have been the fruits of those labours. Instead of repining, therefore (should such a feeling stir in our bosoms), that the light which shone upon us has been withdrawn to shine in a brighter sphere, we should be unfeignedly grateful that ever it was kindled, that its rays fell so beneficently upon us for so considerable a period, and instead of dwelling upon the cessation and loss of services, the most efficacious and valuable, and grieving that they are not prolonged, it is only reasonable and just to remark the blessed fruits that have already been gathered, the large amount of good that has been achieved and realised in years gone by.

And this is the view which I earnestly invite you, my dear brethren, to take and dwell upon, and if it does not turn your mourning into joy, it will at least temper and chasten your sorrow, for it furnishes no ordinary call to thankfulness and praise. It will thus be no unprofitable meditation to review in its many aspects the character of our beloved Prince and the lofty virtues of which have seated him so deeply in the hearts of all, as to make the mighty nation of Britain bend in sorrow over his grave.

Twenty-one years ago the name and character of Albert were as eagerly discussed as now, when, as the future husband of our beloved Queen, our country watched so eagerly for every circumstance of his boyhood and youth which might tend to give promise of a manhood of purity and integrity; and if lofty thoughts were engendered at that time and high hopes raised, these thoughts have been nobly embodied and these hopes exalted to a degree beyond human anticipation in the life of the Prince Consort.

As a husband and a father he stood an eminent example of all that was laudable and great. In an age which, as every newspaper shows, is by no means free, as some would have us think, from those grosser vices which are often a prelude to a nation's ruin, he preserved a pure and unspotted fidelity to the wife of his youth, and in the pursuit of relaxation from the grave cares of royalty, so natural and so congenial to the wishes of a manly energetic mind, he presented a spectacle at once lovely and uncommon.

* The first morning lesson for the day was the third chapter of Daniel.

It was not in a round of ceaseless dissipation, varied and interesting as the refinements of modern luxury could render it—it was not in the tumultuous excitement of what is falsely termed a life of pleasure; or in the splendid display of royal magnificence, but in the calm, sequestered scenes of private life and domestic enjoyment and in the cultivation of family attachment that he looked for the attainment of his chiefest happiness.

The marriage of our Sovereign was not, as is often the case, a political necessity. It was a model for all ranks, cemented by mutual love. Our Queen had been united to the husband of her choice, and her choice had fallen on one, who appears of all men to have been best calculated to promote her happiness and to bring her growing virtues to maturity, whose amusements, whose studies, whose tastes, whose feelings accorded with her own, whose judgment guided and whose approbation cheered her progress to perfection.

And who, my dear brethren, who could witness the pure and undivided affection of this illustrious pair and not resolve, like them, to seek for happiness in the calm enjoyments of domestic life?

As a father, how touching his affection, how conscientious and how firm his guidance, how judicious the training of his beloved children. He felt the importance of his trust and he nobly and anxiously fulfilled it. It was pre-eminently as a husband and a father that twenty one years ago England looked to the Prince Consort with glowing hopes that God would bless him and guide him in all wisdom and discretion; and now that the husband and the father is no more, it is with bowed head and tearful eye, but deeply grateful heart, that England bears her tribute of respect, and gratitude, and fondest affection to the noble dead, whom all nations honour, and whom the Almighty vouchsafed so largely to bless.

Much as in our hearts we might fondly long to dwell upon this happiest contemplation of the life of our departed Prince there are other points of character equally instructive and which equally demand a brief notice here. I allude to the prominent part he was called upon to take as the natural counsellor of our Queen in the Government of the State.

Here no ambitious views ever seemed to influence his opinions, no aspirings to grasp the unwieldy sceptre of absolute power. He never courted the popularity of the vain or worthless, or sought to mould the capricious breath of fame to the purposes of his will by the compromise of his opinions at the shrine of prejudice, or by courting the applause of misjudging or misguided zeal. At once perceiving the excellences of the Constitution of his adopted country, and revering it as the best and greatest worldly gift that had ever been conferred on man, his only hopes and intentions were, by his firm and temperate counsels, and by the religious and moral example of his

conduct, to convince the world that that nation is most truly blessed whose sovereign reigns less in the outward splendours of the pomp and power of royalty than in the hearts of a wise, discerning, brave and loyal people. Nor can we sufficiently admire the wisdom and discretion of this great and good Prince, which led him through evil report and good report to pursue a uniform and unobtrusive path of honest integrity in all his counsels for the benefit of the nation.

But not only as a politician and statesman wise in counsel and true in heart the country has reason to deplore him, but as the most active patron in our day of all science and literature. Our nation has been exalted, and our arts and manufactures considerably improved mainly by the deep and untiring interest of the late Prince Consort. No true poet or toil-worn man of letters ever appealed to him in vain. His life was spent in works of humanity and kindness, in fostering learning, in relieving and cherishing the sons of genius and misfortune, and his sainted memory is now richly embalmed with the fragrant offering of the widows' prayers and orphans' tears.

In whatever light we view his actions all is excellence and all is piety. And here is the chief glory of our subject that it is confined to the record of a good man's life, that we need not fear to mingle praises with our tears—that we extract from the treasury of his daily life whatever incense we burn before his tomb, now that "the sun has gone down at noon and the earth been darkened in the clear day."

And, my dear brethren, when our own last hours approach and we are lying on the bed of sickness and pain, may the Father of Mercy and God of all Comfort pour into our hearts the same spirit of devout submission and pious resignation to His Almighty will which marked in an eminent degree the closing scene of our loved Albert's life!

And applying our blessed Saviour's own test, "By their fruits ye shall know them," we commit his body to the ground in sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection to peace and to glory. For what fruits have we seen in him? Of what fruits have we heard as being in him? The fruits of a Christian and a holy life. The fruits of pure faith—the fruits of a just and devout spirit.

But is there not one of whom we ought to speak—one whom the whole nation longs to comfort? Seldom has the mighty heart of Britain been so touched. Seldom has a more unselfish throb of sorrow thrilled through any land, than in this our favoured isle, for the agony and grief of our bereaved and much-loved Queen. Loved she most surely is, and justly loved for virtues that exalt the human heart. There is not a wife or mother in the land whose tribute of tears has not fallen fast and bitter. From the highest to the lowest there is not a man whose heart has not ached for the woe of his Sovereign. We all knew his worth. We

all know her love. What a sad and solemn Christmas falls so unexpectedly upon her and us! What a dreary death-knell closes the expiring year! In the very prime of manhood it has pleased Heaven to strike him down who was the stay and prop of that House which is identified with our best and dearest affection—the home which all England loved to recognise and to honour as the purest sanctuary of virtue and love.

The nation is now entirely absorbed in deep and universal sympathy with the overwhelming grief of the royal mourners, and when we think of that cheerful and loving family circle, whom in their perilous height no breath of calumny has ever sullied, prostrated by a calamity, for which they had no preparation and by a bereavement so untimely, so momentous, and so utterly irreparable—we feel that it is not only the magnitude of the disaster and the exalted sphere of those, upon whom it has been sent, which touches and impresses us, but much more the thorough worthiness, which we see in the sufferers, of our most genuine and unchecked sympathy. If the tears and affection of a whole nation could in any degree mitigate her anguish, then our Lady Queen Victoria would have been indeed relieved. Still there is but One Comforter, and her loyal and faithful people knowing that have carried their prayers for her they love to the mercy-seat of their God—the God of the widow and the fatherless—that she and her children may be supported and strengthened under this their heaviest trial,—submitting to His Holy Will, trusting to His gracious promises, leaning on His everlasting arms. We know the prayer that where two or three are gathered together in my name, I will answer their request, and may we not hope that in His all-wise mercy our God has deigned in some measure to answer our united supplications, when we hear of the continued calmness and noble fortitude of our beloved Sovereign.

Her grief must indeed be great and doubly increased by the poignant anguish of her orphan and sorrowing children. But may our youthful Princes and Princesses, while they mourn the loss of their excellent and illustrious father, contemplate with affection his exemplary virtues! May it be their ambition to imitate his moderation and good sense in his exalted rank, his freedom from the fashionable follies of the times, his benevolence and unaffected affability and above all his abiding faith in the merits of his Redeemer and the mercy of his God. But, as I have impressed upon you before, the hand that inflicted the wound, can alone administer the remedy, the Great Physician can alone apply the healing balm. Let us pray therefore to Almighty God that He will look down with compassion on the dejected state of this illustrious family—that He will lighten the burden of their griefs—and support them with the choicest consolations of His Holy Spirit—that He will

teach them “not to sorrow even as others that have no hope” but soothe their minds with the reflection that the beloved object of their affections is not separated from them for ever—that every day will bring them nearer to the period of their reunion with him, and that meanwhile he has exchanged a perishable for an unfading inheritance, and has passed from this world of sin and woe to regions of purity and endless bliss—there to put off the infirmities of his mortal state, and to be clothed with that perfection in Heaven, which was the object of his highest and holiest aspirations here on earth.

In conclusion, my dear brethren, let the memory of his example be to you who are husbands and fathers a solemn heart-touching sermon. He being dead yet speaketh, for his life was a Living Sermon.

In the prime of manhood, in the mid career of usefulness, in a home with everything that could cheer and gladden life, the pride and delight of these realms, the noble, the virtuous, the gifted one has been smitten down by the dread Destroyer. But his end was Peace. See then that you too keep innocence and take heed to that which is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last. In our Royal chambers a model household has been set before you to copy. You can here point to one occupying the seat of Majesty itself, raised to the highest elevation of human greatness, as a pattern of conjugal affection and of every grace and virtue that can adorn and sanctify an English home.

The voice that speaks to you from that funeral bier in the palace halls at Windsor, oh! how powerful and affecting it is! How tender, how resistless its authority! How persuasive and powerful its counsels! What sweet and holy memories it awakens! How it thrills, while it touches every chord of pure and pious feeling, like the sweet and solemn breathings of the night wind over the strings of a harp finely strung! Yes! he being dead yet speaketh. The grave has not quenched his light. Death has not silenced his dignified accents of authority and entreaty, which are yet ringing in your ears and thrilling in your hearts. I beseech you to listen to the preaching of the dead.

The fondly cherished memory of him brings a message from God to you, more especially to those of you who are parents, and solemnly reminds you that you must meet your children in the day, and before the tribunal, of Christ, and give an account of your parental stewardship. Have you, like this lamented Prince, endeavoured to promote the present interest and everlasting good of these children that have been entrusted by God for a little while to your affection and care, that they might be trained by you for heaven, and led through the dangers and difficulties of the Christian warfare to its everlasting triumph above?

Christian parents, think on this! Do you, like

your departed Prince, really love your children? Are they, as was the case with him, identified with every joy and every hope which your hearts can feel or form? Be careful then for their immortal souls. Acquaint them with the Gospel, with the mercies and the duties of its salvation. Use all diligence to advance their meetness for the heavenly inheritance. Bring them even now to Jesus Christ, the life-giving Saviour, that, when the grave shall close between you and them, the faith of the Son of God may pierce its darkness and behold the hastening dawn of that Eternal Day, when it shall resign its tenants, and when Christian parents shall be re-united to the children, whom they have loved and taught and led towards heaven, in that exceeding abundance of unutterable glory where there shall be no more separations for ever.

And, oh! let the thought of that once happy abode, into which the fell destroyer Death has made ruthless entry and stricken down the father and the husband—that once happy abode now overcast with the shadow of desolation and darkness, awaken one and all of you to serious reflection, teach you to number your days and to apply your hearts unto heavenly wisdom—induce you to enter into the ways of holiness and everlasting life, and convert you, who are lovers of pleasure, into lovers of God, and let this be the effect of the dispensation which we now deplore. The illustrious Prince who has left an empire to mourn his loss—he “whose sun has gone down at noon,” he who met the last enemy with Christian tranquillity, sustained by the consciousness that at the giddiest height and pinnacle of power, and amid the distracting allurements of the world, he had striven to do his duty in humble dependence upon his God and to fulfil his obligations not less as a Christian than as a Prince. He calls upon you by his death and high example to renounce a world of vanity and of sin and to give your heart to our blessed Saviour who alone can make you truly and for ever happy. If he call upon you in vain, then I say, weep not for him but weep for yourselves.

In spite of many enticements, many distractions, he ever lived a pattern of domestic affection and virtuous abstraction from the world, and he died by the inscrutable will of the Almighty that his example might be stamped upon your hearts, and that you might show your submission to the Divine purpose and your admiration of departed worth by imitating the excellence which he was enabled to attain by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and by the Grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

THE Rev. Dr. F. Barlow Guy, head master of Forest School, Walthamstow, who has been appointed Canon of St. Albans, in the room of Archdeacon Carey, resigned, was installed during the afternoon service on Saturday last.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d. are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1884.

THE IRISH CANONS.

SUCH persons as have studied the subject with sufficient care are familiar with the fact that Revision in Ireland happily consisted more in the creation of new canons, than in changes effected in the Prayer Book itself. We say happily, because it was a less radical mode of procedure, and one that could be more easily corrected hereafter. It would be easier, *e.g.*, if thought desirable, to omit one or more objectionable Canons at some future time, than again to place the *corpus* of the Book of Common Prayer itself upon the dissecting table of the General Synod. In dealing with this subject we have no desire to speak in an unfriendly tone or spirit of the Irish Church; there is a dominant circumambient Romanism in Ireland that naturally and even rightly accounts for a strong Protestant element in Irish Churchmanship; but at the same time we desire to see this element not wasting its strength in purely reactionary and negative directions, but kept within due and proper limits. As instances of some ultra-Protestant legislation by the Irish General Synod take the following canons:

Canon xxxvi.—“There shall not be any cross, ornamental or otherwise, on the Communion Table, or on the covering thereof, nor shall a cross be erected or depicted on the wall or other structure behind the Communion Table in any of the Churches or other places of worship of the Church of Ireland.”

Canon xxxvii.—“In the administration of the Lord's Supper the use of wine mixed with water is hereby declared to be unlawful and is prohibited.”

Now first as regards Canon xxxvi., which forbids the erection of a cross on or behind the Communion Table, be it observed that crosses are not illegal elsewhere in Irish Churches. You may see them on spires and gables, on book-markers and bench ends, but not on the Holy Table, where

the Sacrifice on the Cross is specially commemorated. How very inconsistent this is ! If the use of the Cross as a material symbol in churches was totally abolished one could understand it, but to permit its use everywhere but in the very place where of all others it reminds us of His "Cross and Passion" is truly unaccountable. But what emphasises this is that apparently by a strange yet happy inconsistency the use of the sign of the cross has been prominently brought into notice in the Irish Prayer Book by reprinting therein the thirtieth canon of 1604. Here is an extract from it :—

"The honour and dignity of the name of the Cross begat a reverent estimation even in the Apostles' times (for aught that is known to the contrary) of the sign of the Cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their actions : thereby making an outward show and profession even to the astonishment of the Jews that they were not ashamed to acknowledge Him for their Lord and Saviour who died for them upon the cross. And this sign they did not only use themselves with a kind of glory when they met with any Jews, but signed therewith their children when they were christened, to dedicate them by that badge to His service, whose benefits bestowed upon them in Baptism the name of the cross did represent."

The Revised Irish Prayer Book, therefore, while it in one Canon forbids the use of the cross on or behind the Communion Table ; by republishing an old English Canon teaches Irish Church people that in the earliest times Christians made the sign of the cross "in all their actions." Probably at present not one Irish Churchman in a hundred follows this primitive usage, but there is no knowing what may be the case presently, when the teaching of this Canon of 1604 becomes generally known—and though the new canon forbids the material symbol, on or behind the Holy Table ; yet if the Primitive Christians used the sign of the cross "in all their actions" (according to the Canon of 1604), the reception of the Holy Communion must have been one of these actions, and one of the most important too to be marked by such a use ; and we conclude, therefore, that Irish Churchmen may very lawfully adopt it according to the teaching of their Church, at such a time, should they desire to follow primitive custom in the matter. The writer of this article knows a church in Ireland, in the "west" wall of which there is a stained window containing a cross. Yet this is quite legal ! for it is not on or behind the Communion Table. Surely the quick wit of the Irish people will ere long see the anomaly of such an arrangement as this. With regard to Canon xxxvii. (only a portion of which we have quoted), viz., this, "the use of wine mixed with water is unlawful and prohibited," we cannot but express our astonishment that such a canon should ever have been passed by a synod containing such learned divines as the two Irish primates, the late Bishop Fitzgerald, Dr. Salmon, Canons Smith and Jellett, not to mention others. The Irish Church here

puts herself directly in opposition to primitive usage. "The wine in the original institution was" (says the late Dean Stanley), "as we know from the practice at the Paschal Supper, arranged in two, three, or sometimes four cups or rather bowls. In the bowl was the wine of Palestine *mixed with water*. The water is not expressly mentioned either in the account of the original institution or in the earliest accounts of the primitive Communion, *but it was beyond question there* in accordance with the universal practice of the ancient world. To drink wine without water was like drinking pure brandy now. The name of the bowl which they used was *κρατήρ*, which means a mixing vessel. To this day wine in modern Greek is called *κρασί*, "the mixed." The following note is added : "Thus in the Syro-Jacobitic Liturgy it is said He temperately and moderately mingled the wine and water. It is also mentioned in Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, c. 97."* Should it be said that this is a small matter in itself we fully admit it ; but is not this all the more reason why the Irish Church should not specially prohibit an innocent usage sanctioned by the Saviour Himself, and accordant with universal ancient practice? We cannot refrain from expressing a hope that such Canons as those we have referred to, may yet be removed from the statute book of the Irish Church. They are very painful to some of her best friends and her best sons. They give occasion to the enemy to speak reproachfully and derisively. We know of course the dangers connected with re-opening legislation of this kind ; and we must leave it to such Irish Churchmen as sympathise with the views we have now expressed to choose a suitable opportunity for doing so. When that will offer we cannot pretend to prophesy ; but considering the advance of Church feeling in Ireland since the passing of these Canons, we should hope it is "within measurable distance." At all events we feel inclined to say that so far have sounder Church views and practices progressed in Ireland during the last ten years that we think it doubtful that the Canons we have referred to would now be passed by the General Synod, if proposed for the first time. We have no desire merely to carp at what has been done in Ireland, and in proof of this we conclude our article with noticing what seems to us a most decided gain in the Communion office of the Irish Prayer Book. The following most suitable Collect on behalf both of the Church Militant and the Church Expectant can now be used immediately after the *Gloria in excelsis* :—

"Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, we humbly beseech Thee that it

* See also Paper read by Bishop of Durham at late Church Congress on the epitaph discovered at Hieropolis in 1883 :—"Faith gives this fish to her friends to eat continually offering good wine and giving a *mixed cup* with bread."—*Guardian*, October 15th, 1884.

may please Thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect and to hasten Thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN?

SIR,—Some reply from me on the subject of Papias's testimony is long overdue. His account of our first Gospel certainly presents a knotty problem. It may represent only his critical judgment on various documents, Hebrew and Greek, which he had seen. His words, however, "Every one interpreted them" (*i.e.*, "The Oracles," written by Matthew) "as he could," seem, as Professor Lightfoot has pointed out, to imply the existence of one established version in his own day, which day seems to have been earlier than is generally supposed. His account of St. Mark's Gospel stands on a different footing. He gives his authority, "the Presbyter," who, from the context in Eusebius, is with very little doubt "John the Presbyter," "the disciple" (that is to say, judging by Papias's other use of the expression in close context, "the personal follower"), "of the Lord."

"F. T. P." suggests (Sept. 6th) that our present Gospel is founded partly on the original Mark, partly on the ground document of the Synoptists, but how much does he leave for the original Mark? Our second Gospel he argues is "in order" (while the Mark of John the Presbyter was by his account not written "in order"). Very good; then on this theory our second Gospel owes its order to some extraneous source. Our second Gospel, he further maintains (I believe it to be at least highly probable that he is right), presents the nearest approach in wording to the ground document from which the common matter of the Synoptists is derived. I suppose, then, we may infer that very little of Mark's wording remains. He also contends that our second Gospel cannot be the document which John the Presbyter mentions, because the former is wanting in traces of the personality of St. Peter. So that, according to "F. T. P.," the unknown editor of St. Mark destroyed a characteristic that must have been visibly stamped on his original. Fourthly, if our second Gospel keeps closest to the ground document, inasmuch as it but rarely diverges into incidents not found in one or both of the other Synoptists, I ask again how much is left of the original St. Mark? One is reminded of Spurgeon's rustic who wanted his gun repaired with a new stock, a new lock, and a new barrel. The real Mark's Gospel, founded on Peter's teaching, whatever it was, seems to have been a famous document. We hear this account of Peter's mediate authorship from Papias in Asia Minor, from Clement of Alexandria, and we have a probable reference to the tradition from Justin, who settled in Rome. To suppose that this document could have been wholly supplanted and obliterated, while a new document differing broadly in its wording, and broadly in its contents, and broadly in its order, silently took its place, and was mistaken by everyone for the original, is surely a far greater difficulty than can exist against

supposing that John the Presbyter believed our present Gospel to be not written in order. Mark may have had a more chronological order than Matthew or Luke, but whether his order was the actual order of the occurrences, John the Presbyter, if wholly or partially an eye-witness, had clearly better means of knowing than we have. Is it not the more probable view that Peter, by the time he left Jerusalem, was furnished with something like the ground document of the Synoptists, preserved, I daresay, by means of such memoranda as "F. T. P." suggests (Oct. 25th), or possibly in memory only, and that Mark took note from his teaching.

Now concerning the relation of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* to the existence of our Gospels. We are given as one reason why our Gospels could not at the period of the *Teaching* have existed "*in their present shape*," that the study of them is not pressed in the *Teaching*. Are we then to suppose that our Gospels must have been recommended, but any original Mark or interpretation of Matthew may have been shunted? "If so, why so?" Papias is often quoted, whether with correct interpretation I do not now discuss, as having little value for written Gospels; are we to be told that this was all owing to his not having known the elaborate ones at present in use? But, argues "F. T. P.," the *Teaching* quotes the Sermon on the Mount not from our present Gospels. I scarcely expect him to maintain that "the Way of Life and the Way of Death" is intended as direct quotation from the Sermon on the Mount; while the version of the Lord's Prayer is reasonably close to St. Matthew, differing in nothing that ordinarily varying "text" from ours will not easily account for, which is more than can be said for some patristic quotations from our present Gospels. What then is "F. T. P.'s" point about the quotations from the Sermon? Theories of re-written documents are easily made, but if such a *cacoethes rescribendi* seized the Christians of the second century that they re-wrote not only the Hebrew Matthew, but also Mark and the "we sections" of Luke, I think we should find, in at least one of the three, clear traces of second century notions, such as Papias's legend about the prophecy of the abundant vines in the Millennium, or traces of the Gnostic controversy, or obliteration of the difficulty that we find in Matthew and Mark from the seeming mingling of prophecies of the Last Day with those of the destruction of Jerusalem (I believe that the latter event symbolises the former, but, however it be explained, the difficulty is there). But, Sir, while I think these presumptions exist against second century re-writing, it must be remembered that the burden of proof in each instance lies on him who asserts the re-writing. My position, of course, is immensely strengthened if the genuineness of the third Gospel be admitted. Unvarying patristic testimony, joined to the claim of the "we sections," and their marked coincidences in style with the rest of the Lucan writings, seems to me to make a sufficient case to stand in default of strong countervailing evidence, and I think I have shown that this presumption is strongly supported. To my original seven points (May 31st) for the Third Gospel, two have been added in the course of this discussion, viz., "F. T. P.'s" contribution of the fact of Luke's coincidences with the Pauline phraseology, and Dr. Sanday's argument from the "Western" corruptions of Marcion's text. On the other hand the argument from "The Medical Language of St. Luke" has had exceptions pointed

out of which I was not aware when I commenced this controversy. My main argument for the genuineness of Luke's Gospel could quite afford the loss of the medical language, but, for reasons given elsewhere in a note on your learned Review (Nov. 15th) of Dr. Hobart's work, I still think that the medical language furnishes a sound argument. I am clearly of opinion that "F. T. P." fails to prove that my letters on the Gospels are a self-imposed task. Will the reader look at his reasons (Oct. 25th) and decide? For my summary of evidence on the date of the Synoptic or three first Gospels, see my letter of August 23rd. Perhaps I may also refer to that of Sept. 20th.

ERIGENA.

OVERCROWDING OF THE POOR.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to say that it was in the sense in which Mr. Bladon himself interprets his letter that I understood it. Further, I should like to remark that as long as the habits of a people remain unaltered and that they continue to multiply as at present up to the starvation limit, unchecked by moral or prudential considerations, emigration, even on the largest scale, or the improvement in agriculture, can give nothing more than temporary relief. Let the stream of emigration be what it may, the source from whence it issues (the power of multiplication in the human, as in all other species) is practically infinite. The law of population is this, that there is a continual tendency in all animated nature to increase faster than the means of subsistence, however fast that may increase. Suppose, then, that the present pressure were relieved, we will say by "State-directed emigration" such as that advocated by Lord Brabazon, who can give us any guarantee that population will not immediately start forward, increasing in the same ratio as the relief afforded, till it again reaches the starvation limit, and again receives its present species of check? For what is it that is now preventing the population of England from increasing at a much greater rate than it is actually doing? Certainly not any limitation in its inherent power of multiplication, for in other lands our race has been known to double its numbers in less than twenty-five years.

As a matter of fact the check has been of a three-fold character. 1st, moral restraint, under which are included all the prudential motives which prevent marriages, etc. 2nd, vice. 3rd, starvation, and its accompaniments, disease, misery, infanticide, etc.

Now, if we want to be quit of the two latter methods there is no possible way but that of falling back in a proportionate degree upon the former. Then, according to the law of natural selection, there will be a continual tendency in Nature to bring to the front the children of those parents who practise such restraint, for they, being better fed, better educated, etc., will have a better chance of preservation in the struggle for existence than the children of those parents who have large families. And thus Nature, by the law of heredity, will more and more tend to produce and foster that type of the human species which the altered environment of modern civilisation now demands, in preference to that type which suited the totally different condition of things which existed in former ages of the world.

(MRS.) CHARLOTTE STUART.

[Inasmuch as our fair and able correspondent has no pretension to be thought wiser than her Creator,

we would respectfully suggest to her that there is no waste in Nature. The apparent waste of life in one age is, like our coal-fields, for the enrichment of future ages. As to her moral and prudential motives and schemes for improving our race by natural selection, we hold with "B." in our last week's issue, that they are delusive. If true, the restricted families of Frenchmen, who have applied the restraint for many generations, ought to be superior in *physique* and *morale* to Englishmen and Americans; or, to institute a fairer comparison between Jewish and other families resident in London, the former, often averaging from ten to sixteen children, are vastly superior in health, longevity, and worldly success to the smaller Christian families living side by side with them; or, to make a still fairer comparison between small and large families of any class of Englishmen, we believe that if a census was taken of the health, longevity, and success in life of their children, the superiority would be on the side of large families.—ED.]

"MILD EXPLETIVES."

SIR,—As a reader of your paper for some five or six years, I regret to find that of late the tone of its leading articles on ecclesiastical topics has become so severe and one-sided. The writer loses no opportunity of girding at the Archbishop of Canterbury or any other prelate, whose sacramental views are higher than his own. Thus in the leader of Saturday last we have such objectionable expressions as "wafer-worship," and "idolatrous ritual," hurled at the devoted head of the Bishop of London. Would you allow me to quote the following lines for the edification of the author of these "mild expletives?" I have altered only one word to make them more applicable :—

But first I would remark, that it is not a proper plan
For any theologic gent to whale his fellow man,
And if a member don't agree with his *peculiar whim*,
To lay for that same member for to "put a head" on him.

I have already given a few specimens from the early part of the article, "thus bad begins but worse remains behind," *e.g.*, "prominent superstition," "votaries of that idolatry," "churches to be devoted to gross idolatry!" Plenty of "sound and fury" here certainly, but I can only think of the writer of such hysterical English, that

in his brain,
Which is as dry as the remainder biscuit
After a voyage—he hath strange places crammed
With observation, the which he vents
In mangled forms.

As I see Canon Crosthwaite is now a contributor to your columns, I sincerely hope he will make his shillelagh acquainted with the head of your leader writer; it is a well-known skull-cracker.

FAIR PLAY.

[If a practice is idolatrous, it is not only a right, but a duty, to say that it is so. We have maintained that certain practices, now generally connived at by the bishops, are idolatrous. "Fair Play" should take one of those impugned, and attempt to prove the negative. Our correspondent cannot be expected to know that, on this side of St. George's Channel, we do not, in our ecclesiastical controversies, have recourse to the shillelagh—*rationi ultimæ Hibernorum*. Such, however, is the case. Here we chop logic, but do not knock heads. Our columns are freely open to all

sides of the great questions that we discuss ; and, as we think that a free discussion of the particular question to which "Fair Play" alludes would be very useful at the present crisis, we will state it again, as it stands between ourselves and the Bishop of London. We maintain that the worship of a wafer, biscuit, or morsel of bread, supposed to contain the Deity, is an idolatry—a fetish worship. The Bishop holds (if we have understood rightly his charge and his action) that it is "a way of approaching and exhibiting divine truth." We should like to see this question thoroughly discussed ; and if "Fair Play" has any arguments to offer on either side of it we shall have great pleasure in inserting them—only we must draw a line at the shillelagh.—ED.]

Reviews and Notices.

NOTES ON THE REVIEW OF DR. HOBART'S "MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE."

BEFORE entering on the central argument of the Review, I wish to speak of two subsidiary matters. Your reviewer reckons that of words peculiar in the New Testament to the Lucan writings there are in Dr. Hobart's list

Peculiar to the Gospel and the Acts.	Peculiar to the Gospel.	Peculiar to the Acts.
25	147	40

Endeavouring to check this result, I first deducted from Dr. Hobart's list all words which he claims as only peculiar to Luke in their Medical meaning, or peculiar as occurring elsewhere in quotation only, and having further checked the list with Alford's references, I find the words which Alford and Hobart agree to mark as peculiar to Luke in the New Testament to be as follows, or perhaps within two or three of it,

Peculiar to the Gospel and the Acts.	Peculiar to the Gospel.	Peculiar to the Acts.
24	90	146

Possibly in your reviewer's statement Luke and Acts have accidentally changed places, but there would still remain the large discrepancy of forty-eight in the total. Can your reviewer clear this up? Among my deductions were nine words which Alford leaves doubtful, one doubtful or half doubtful case remains in my statement, because I forget which heading it should be removed from.

The second matter is this. Your reviewer thinks Dr. Hobart broaches a dangerous theory in suggesting or implying that Luke introduced into the language of our Lord's discourses a medical complexion not originally there. The objection seems easily answered if as your reviewer believes (and probably with truth) our Lord spoke in Aramaic ; there would then be no reason to object to any adequate Greek rendering. But did your reviewer remember that he had just before claimed over forty quotations as proofs of Luke's study of the Septuagint? How many of these quotations can be found independently of the utterances of various speakers? Not, I think, the forty ; not, I think, half the forty ; not, I think, a quarter of the forty ; not, as far as my recollection goes, an eighth of the forty. Has your reviewer not then, unconsciously perhaps, propounded the dangerous theory that the author of the third Gospel and Acts has introduced a Septuagint complexion not

originally there into various utterances which he records?

What I have referred to as the central argument of your reviewer is his statement that of the words in Dr. Hobart's list, about ninety per cent. occur in the Septuagint, including the so-called Apocrypha, and that the remaining ten per cent. are almost cleared away if we consult the whole range of Greek classical writing, but in particular Josephus, Arrian, Polybius, and Diodorus Siculus. The ninety per cent. perhaps holds for the whole list, but I do not think the percentage amounts to eighty for those I have tabulated as peculiar in the New Testament to Luke ; even that percentage is undoubtedly high. Assuming the complete accuracy of your reviewer, it seems to me that he tries to enforce a misleading test. Since, as he truly informs us, Greek medical terms were of native growth, and had no foreign derivation, can it promise a fair result if you refuse to consider in evidence any word that can be found in the whole range of non-medical Greek literature down perhaps to the time of the Crusades, if your reviewer includes Byzantine writers as classical? Repeated coincidences in vocabulary may furnish a very strong argument, notwithstanding, especially when they are added to coincidences of phrase. Probably the late Anthony Trollope used no word in his novels that cannot be found elsewhere in English literature, yet I remember reading in his Autobiography that Mr. Hutton was able to detect his style in a novel published anonymously. "F. T. P." has lately told us of the numerous words and phrases common to the Lucan and Pauline writings. Surely his question, "Whence does this similarity arise?" could not be answered by saying that the Septuagint contains (as I daresay it does contain) a large percentage of these words, and that the others can be almost all found, chiefly in authors of St. Paul's period, but by searching also Greek literature generally. The Septuagint was open to every New Testament writer, and Septuagint usage hardly accounts for some two hundred and odd words being peculiar to Luke. Medical usage would account for this in large measure. There is external evidence that Luke was a physician, and that Luke wrote the third Gospel and the Acts. Does a study of these books confirm the external evidence? I think it does, both from the medical phrases, *συνεχομένη πυρετῶ μεγάλῳ, δακτύλῳ προσπαύειν, τῷμα βελόνης, ἀρχαί* in connection with *ὁδόν*, and other phrases medical or found in medical writings ; from the vocabulary ; from other aspects of the argument set forth in Dr. Hobart's Introduction ; and probably from another suggested to me by a learned friend, namely, the manner of Luke's preface. Dr. Hobart, *ἀπόρος* of St. Luke's use in the preface of the word *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, quotes Hippocrates (in beginning his treatise, "De Priscâ Medicinâ")—

ὁκόσοι ἐπεχείρησαν περὶ ἱητρικῆς λέγειν ἢ γράφειν, and Galen as beginning his treatise "De Foetus Formatione"—

περὶ τῆς τῶν κυμένων διαπλάσεως ἐπεχείρησαν μὲν τε καὶ φιλόσοφοι γράφειν :

but a far closer resemblance in matter, though not in words, is furnished by the preface of Dioscorides which my friend has sent me.

πολλῶν οὐ μόνον ἀρχαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ νέων, συνταξαμένων περὶ τῆς τῶν φαρμάκων σκευασίας τε καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δοκιμασίας, φιλῶτατε Ἀρειε, πειράσσομαι σοι παραστήσαι μὴ

κενήν μηδὲ ἄλογον ὁρμὴν ἐσχηκέναι πρὸς τήνδε τὴν πραγ-
ματείαν διὰ τὸ τοὺς μέν αὐτῶν μὴ τετελειωκέναι τοὺς δὲ ἐξ
ἱστορίας τὰ πλεῖστα ἀναγράφαι.

"Here the parallelism with the Prologue of St. Luke is very remarkable, the attempts of others, his own fitness for the work, the imperfection of what some had previously done, and the fact that others had their information at second-hand, besides the whole character of the formula."

My friend is not unknown as a learned writer, though not on this subject. Perhaps I may add that the Medical writer, Celsus, begins with an enumeration of previous authors. The inference I wish to press is not, of course, that Luke copied from Dioscorides (whose date conjecturally given seems slightly later), but that such prefaces seem to have been in the manner of Medical writers.

I. L. H.

"FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION;" or The Ninety-five Theses and the Three Primary Works of Dr. Martin Luther." Edited by The Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., and C. A. Buchheim, Ph. D. London: J. Murray, 1883. Pp. 245.

In the introduction, Dr. Wace tells us that, of the three great Reformation treatises which this volume contains, the "Treatise on Christian Liberty," has been translated into English, but not of late years; the "Address to the German Nobility," has not been translated at all, neither has the "Treatise on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church." To some this fact might perhaps furnish a text for some very cynical observations on the value of the many sermons and meetings, and the much laudation of Luther, which took place little more than a year ago. And certainly it seems strange that they never have been translated before, if, as Dr. Wace says, "it is well understood in Germany that it is in these that the whole genius of the Reformer appears in its most complete and energetic form." All three treatises were produced in the latter half of the critical year 1520, when nearly three years' controversy since the publication of the Theses on 31st Oct., 1517, had convinced Luther of the falseness of the Court of Rome and the hollowness of its claims, and they were immediately followed by the bull of excommunication in the winter of the same year, and by the summons to the Diet of Worms in A.D. 1521. These facts would alone be sufficient to make the three treatises interesting to all who take any interest in the history of the period, but without that they are interesting enough of themselves. Whether or not "the whole genius of the Reformer" is displayed in them or not, certainly all his energy is—a burning energy, and a zeal truly magnificent. One quite understands, after reading them, why Luther succeeded when so many of his predecessors and contemporaries failed. One quite understands also why Luther said of the Epistle to the Galatians that it was *his* epistle. The treatise "On Christian Liberty" is in many respects simply the Epistle to the Galatians "writ large." It is in fact a theological pamphlet, just as the Address to the Nobility is a political pamphlet, and the "Babylonish Captivity" an ecclesiastical pamphlet. All three are simply gigantic pamphlets—they had time for gigantic pamphlets in those days, when there were no newspapers—with all the faults of pamphlets, and all the

power of pamphlets, but for all that they make one quite understand why Luther succeeded. It was energy, pure and simple; certainly it was not doctrine, although we think the late Canon Mozley somewhat overstated Luther's teaching on justification by faith; nor was it the display of a great wealth of learning, it was simply energy, energy, energy. No wonder that in 1525 the peasantry rose in insurrection, no wonder also, we are bound to add, that, as Professor Buchheim says, "Luther's enemies attributed the outbreak of the war to the influence of his teachings." The war was *not* the effect of Luther's teaching, but, none the less, he who leads an assault with violence of language, which is *his* way, can hardly be surprised if thicker heads and thicker arms follow it up in the way which is *their* way.

Yet for all that, we think that every one, after reading these three treatises, will, whatever his opinion of Luther was before, come away with a better one of their author, although for ourselves we still wish more and more that Erasmus and not Luther had taken the work in hand. But, however that may be, Dr. Wace and Professor Buchheim have given us one of the most interesting books of the year.

"THE SALT OF LIFE." Thoughts for Candidates for Confirmation, by the Rev. N. A. Garland, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Brixton. London: James Nisbet and Co. Pp. 31. Price 3d.

THIS little book, which is prettily bound in paper, is well adapted as a gift to all candidates for confirmation. Its readers are taught the great value to the world of the true disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. "Few and weak the true disciples may seem to be; small and broken into many grains like salt; yet all the time they are working silently upon the world." The closing words of counsel are most valuable, showing how alone we may become the salt of the earth by being born again by the power of the Holy Ghost, and urging the earnest use of David's prayer, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me," and reminding us that only Jesus Christ is *pure* salt, and that we must keep close to Him in order to have life and energy and purity.

"POVERTY," by James Platt, F.S.S., Author of "Business," "Money," "Economy," &c. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1s.

THIS little work deals with one of the most difficult social problems of all ages, which it treats very skilfully and with much good common sense. The foundation on which the author rests his arguments is the necessity of improving the people themselves in order to benefit the condition of the working classes, he states that socialism would only tend to their injury instead of their good, and says that "the motive that causes wealth and poverty must be studied more, and explained so as to cause working men to view the capitalist class as their friends." He shows that making paupers of the lower classes is a great mistake, and that the one aim of all philanthropists should be to teach and help men and women to help themselves, and to plant within them the desire to be better than they are, and teach the workmen how to work to the best of their ability. We commend this little book to all who are interested in the working classes.

AN exchange of the advowsons of Chorley, county Lancaster, and Eaglescliffe, county Durham, was gazetted on Friday last. Each benefice is a rectory of the annual value of £1,000. In consequence of the exchange the Bishop of Manchester becomes patron of Chorley, and the Rev. G. C. Master, vicar of Thurnham, patron of Eaglescliffe.

THE Bishops of Carlisle, Liverpool, and Dover have lately become patrons of the Church Parochial Mission Society, so that the work of this society is now sanctioned by fourteen members of the Episcopate. We are informed that thirty-four churches during the Mission now concluded in the north and east of London were supplied through the agency of this society, whose object it is to promote Missions throughout England. The committee is prepared to give similar aid also to incumbents during the February portion of the London Mission.

LAST evening week the Bishop of Ripon was welcomed on his first visit to Bradford by the Church Sunday-school teachers. His lordship, in the course of a short speech, said he did not believe that Englishmen, however much they may vary from north to south or from east to west, or however necessary it might be to make redistributions of political power, would ever need to make a large redistribution in that greatest and best of all power—the power of being able to work warmly and sympathetically together; for was it not true that this was the true source of all social greatness, that we were capable of feeling with and for one another? Bishop Carpenter has also visited Leeds, where he has been very cordially received.

THE Fawcett Memorial meeting at Cambridge on Saturday was an influential one, but the numbers present were unaccountably small; the speeches were most interesting, especially those of Mr. Leslie Stephen, who spoke with much feeling of the personal friendship he had enjoyed for years, and of Professor Stuart, whose words recalled most forcibly the face and figure it is proposed to perpetuate on canvas. After some consideration his friends have determined on this form of personal memorial rather than a bust. Sir Henry Maine and Mr. Sedley Taylor spoke not so much from intimate acquaintance as on the work Mr. Fawcett had done, and the position he had taken as a political economist. There was evidently a strong feeling against making an appeal to the public, or bringing any pressure to bear on his friends to raise a very large memorial fund; but any surplus that remains over after the expense of the portrait is defrayed will be devoted to the promotion of the studies he had at heart, either by founding a prize, a scholarship, or forming a fund for the publication and reprinting of important memoirs.

OPium IN BRITISH BURMA.—In the Report on Criminal Justice in British Burma for 1883, Mr. Hodgkinson, Commissioner of the large and populous division of Irawady, observes: "Opium, drink, and gambling are the three curses of the country, and to cope with these evils the present machinery is utterly inadequate. The terrible growth of opium eating and smoking, and the evil effects which have made themselves felt wherever the drug permeates, have been dwelt upon again and again, yet nothing has been done which really tends to check the evil, except in the Kyaukpyu district of the Arakan division, where opium shops have been entirely abolished with the most beneficial result. In this division, it is true, the number of shops has been greatly reduced, and the selling price

of the drug somewhat raised; but the only effect of the change has been an enormous increase in smuggling and law-breaking (which the high value and small bulk of the drug make it most difficult to effectually check), in order to disseminate opium throughout the country, without reducing the consumption in the very least. A large revenue is secured to government by the present system, but it is secured by sapping the very hearts' blood of the people, the better classes of whom most bitterly reproach us, and in my opinion very justly, for our apathy and misgovernment in this matter; no material improvement can be looked for until opium shops are licensed for sale on the premises only, and the possession of opium outside the shops in any quantity, however small, is rendered penal.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Allen, Rev. Andrew James Campbell, M.A., Vicar of Cherry-hinton.
 Birks, Rev. Edward Bickersteth, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Michael, Cambridge.
 Blackman, Rev. Thomas John Mark Willoughby, D.C.L., Rector of Catmore, Berks.
 Blackmore, Rev. John Chanter, Rector of Kelling-with-Salt-house, Norfolk; Rector of Morchard Bishop, Devon.
 Blyth, Rev. Thomas Allen, B.A., Curate of St. Saviour's, Pont Street, Belgrave Square, S.W.; Vicar of Stoke, in the City of Coventry.
 Browne, Rev. John Carter, D.D., Rector of Thurning.
 Churchill, Rev. Reginald, Rector of Berry Nabor.
 Cleary, Rev. Richard, Rector of Banningham, Norfolk.
 Cox, Rev. Joseph Mercer, M.A., Vicar of Plympton St. Mary, and Chaplain of Plympton Workhouse.
 Daubeney, Rev. Edmund Thomas, M.A., Rector of Weston Market.
 Edward, Rev. John Wilkinson Gamul, B.A., Vicar of Melchbourne.
 Field, Rev. Ernest Walter, M.A., Rector of Petrockstowe.
 Gladstone, Rev. Stephen Edward, Rector of Hawarden; Rural Dean for the Deanery of Mold.
 Hanbury, Rev. John Capel, M.A., Rector of Bourton-on-the-Water.
 Jackson, Rev. H. L., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Houghton, Huntingdon; Incumbent of St. James, Sydney, N.S.W.
 Lester, Rev. T. Major, Vicar of St. Mary, Kirkdale; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
 Orton, Rev. Jabez William, L.Th., Vicar of St. Stephen and All Martyrs, Lowermoor, Oldham.
 Palmer, Rev. H. J., A.K.C., Curate of Northfleet, Gravesend; Vicar of Staplefield, Sussex.
 Peacock, Rev. William, Perpetual Curate of St. Luke's, Dartington.
 Rudd, Rev. Eric John Sutherland, M.A., Vicar of Horningsea.
 Savage, Rev. H. E., M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi, Cambridge, Vicar of Pelton; Vicar of Christ Church, West Hartlepool.
 Seddon, Rev. Richard Toller, Rector of Evesbach.
 Thompson, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Datchet and Rural Dean; Chaplain, Ditton Park, Slough.
 Tuson, Rev. E. L., M.A., Chaplain of the Chapel Royal, Windsor Park; Vicar of Kingsthorpe, near Northampton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Clarke, Rev. Thomas Ambrose, late Rector of Kellaways, Wilts, at the Grove, Chippenham, Wilts, on the 6th inst., aged 78.
 Girdlestone, Rev. Edward, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Bristol Cathedral, and Vicar of Olveston, Gloucestershire, at Canons House, Bristol, on the 4th inst., aged 79.
 Granville, Rev. Augustus Kerr B., M.A., Cantab, Vicar of Bearpark, Durham, at St. Edmund's Vicarage, on the 5th inst., aged 68.
 Madden, Rev. James Arnold Wycliffe, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford, youngest son of the late Sir Frederick Madden, K.H., F.R.S., at Erlsmere, Dickoya, Ceylon, on the 10th ult., aged 34.



The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRISTIANITY—PRINCIPLES, NOT RULES.

SERMON PREACHED AT BRIGSTOCK, NOV. 9TH, 1884.

BY REV. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A., VICAR OF
BRIGSTOCK, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

“Till seven times.”—MATT. xviii. 21.

THERE is perhaps no weakness more characteristic of human nature than the desire to be thought magnanimous. Men like to be thought large-hearted. “Till seven times?” That was a very great deal to do. Aye, and Peter is not alone in this respect. Have I not now been very generous? nobly so? I have been grossly insulted and I have freely forgiven the offender.

We must, however, be careful not to seem to say a thing which is not true. It is quite true men like to be thought very charitable, but it is also true that it does not often take the shape indicated here. Men do not like to forgive. Most men think they lose their dignity when they forgive. Self-importance will not permit many men to forgive, when they have received an injury. It says always, No; you must have satisfaction. True, we live in days when the laws forbid men to take satisfaction in their own way. Duels are happily now not possible. This does not alter the fact that magnanimity does not often show itself in acts of forgiveness. It is no part of a great mind to forgive. More is the pity.

Yet the desire to be thought magnanimous still obtains. It takes the shape of daring. That man is large-hearted who dares, who is brave to face dangers, bold to fight a foe, fearless to overcome difficulties. General Gordon, for instance, is magnanimous. The world admires him because it thinks he possesses these qualities. We do not detract from his merits, doubtless he deserves all the praise he receives. We go further and admit that it is more than probable that he would also, as he is a true Christian, display that magnanimity of soul which leads a man to forgive an injury. But the world would not admire him for it. The world does not care about the spirit of forgiveness.

Peter meant to be large-hearted in forgiving. If we could analyse his thought we should find that it probably contained such reasoning as this; Yes, it is right to forgive. I admit it. But stop, let me see; I do not think it can be right to go on for ever forgiving. There must be some limit. Say I forgive once, twice, thrice, well, say seven times. Yes, I am prepared to forgive just so many times.

Vol. XVIII.—No. 469.

I will refer it to the Master. I feel sure He will say it is very kind of me to think of forgiving so much, for I know there are many people who would not think of forgiving once. I have seen such people. They have taken offence, even when there has been no thought of giving it, and retaliated. These same people have ruminated, it may be, for days and nights and have given themselves no peace until they have returned as much as they have thought themselves to have received. The Master knows this too. I will refer the matter to Him, “Lord how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive, till seven times? I say not unto thee, Till seven times, but Until seventy times seven.”

Aye, aye, Peter, as yet thou knowest but little of the true nature of Christianity. It takes no account at all of offences in this way. It does not admit the spirit of retaliation at all. You must never retaliate; “I say not Until seven times but Until seventy times seven.”

The Saviour illustrates all this by a very instructive parable. It is not our intention this morning to follow out the teaching respecting the particular nature of forgiveness, or of the necessity of cultivating the spirit of forgiveness, or to show that there is no heaven without it. All this is true and withal very profitable to consider; but we have now a different object in view.

We want to illustrate what it very distinctly teaches, that Christianity is not a system of rules. It does not regulate a man's life by specifying the hour of rising and going to rest, how long he must work, what and how much he must eat, or how much he should do for God. It does not regulate for him the way he should spend his money, or how much he should give to religious objects. It does not say how often he should go to Church, how much of the Bible he should read, or how many prayers he should say. It does not say how much or how often he should fast. It does not, in short, lay down a hundred and one rules, difficult to remember and hard to apply. Christianity is nothing of this sort. It is a system of principles.

“Now abideth,” says St. Paul, “faith, hope, and charity, these three, and the greatest of these is charity.” These are the great principles of Christianity, and the foundation principle is charity, love, love to God, love to our neighbour.

Christianity is not a system of rules regulating from without, it is a system of principles working from within. How then does love operate? It is not an easy question to answer, but we will do our best with it. How does the principle work towards God? What sort of questions does it lead a man to ask respecting his duty? Does it lead him to say, How much does He require of me? Is that the sort of question it puts? No; it asks rather How can I best please Him? I would like to do all such things as please Him; what can I do? It never asks, How little? Here

is exactly the difference between a rule and a principle. The rule says How little can I do, so as to come well within the demands of duty? The principle says, How much can I do for Him, who has done so much for me? The principle of love does not work from a sense of duty. This is a very important point to remember. Men do not serve God best, when they work from a sense of duty. They serve Him best when they are actuated by the principle of love. A slave says, I will do it because it is my duty. A son says, I love Him, therefore will I please Him. And "we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father."

There is another thing to be remarked here—a very important thing, though too frequently overlooked: wherever the element of pleasure is wanting in what a man does for God, then is God not pleased; the work is never acceptable to God. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." "Faith worketh by love." Love takes no account of the work done. It forgets, "forgetting those things that are behind," it goes on to do more and more.

This is as it should be, because it will follow that the Christian will be happy in his work. He will be able not only to say, "Thy commandments are not grievous," but also, "I delight to do Thy will, O God." Men talk of pleasure, and say they must have it to relieve the monotony of life and make life endurable; but the Christian takes all his pleasure out of his work. He draws pleasure from an inexhaustible source. Hence, too, the apostle could say, "Rejoice in the Lord alway, and again I say rejoice."

And if the principle of love work without rule towards God, it works equally so towards one's neighbour. The relations into which a man is brought with his neighbour are many. It would seem that in all his intercourse with his fellow men, it would be necessary to be guided by a great variety of rules, but in such a case who would supply them? Who, for instance would undertake to lay down the rules for the guidance of a father, a magistrate, a pastor? Then in all the other relations and circumstances of life, how many would these rules be? It would be impossible to estimate the labour for the accomplishment of such a task. Christianity supplies us with a better plan. It says, Love. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour." And yet love is an active principle. It is not latent merely, it is active. It is not a negative principle. It is a positive one. It worketh good. To all alike? Yes, to all alike. To those who offend? Yes, to those who offend. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst give him drink." "Pray for them that persecute you." "Do good to them that hate you." "Bless and curse not."

We will not discuss the question here as to the

happy state which would obtain if men everywhere were filled with this principle and were actuated by it. We have seen that it means pleasure when in operation towards God. It means pleasure here. There is no pleasure equal to that which comes from doing noble deeds from this principle of love. It is true, real, and lasting pleasure. What so likely to give pleasure? Suppose a case. You have been offended and have wreaked your vengeance. Well, and what has been the profit? Pleasure? Satisfaction of any sort? It is the devil's satisfaction. There is no pleasure in doing injury, no, not even to the greatest foe.

But now arises the question, and it is by no means unimportant, How can I obtain this principle? There are many people who say that, in order to be what we ought and such as God would have us, we must call up the good things we have in us. But how if we have none? Believe me, there is a better plan. This principle must be implanted. It is God-given; it cannot be called up in us. This love must be shed abroad in our hearts. It does not grow in us; it must be put in us. God does it; He alone can do it. But how does He do it? It is the work of the Spirit. The Spirit leads us to God, to the Saviour, shows us the Saviour, the bleeding Saviour. Yes, that is it exactly; the Spirit leads us to Calvary. It is there and from there the love comes. Go to Gethsemane and to Calvary if you would learn to love. Pray rather that the Spirit would lead you. If you would have this love, there is no other method. Take this promise for your encouragement, "If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him."

RESULTS OF RECENT HISTORICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH UPON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

A PAPER BY THE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM,
READ AT THE CARLISLE CONGRESS.

WHEN I took counsel with myself how I should treat the subject intrusted to me, and what limitations I should fix to the range of topics included in my paper, I soon found that I had little or no choice. The boundary line was distinctly traced out for me by circumstances. In the first place I saw that the readers and speakers who would follow me were exceptionally competent to speak of the Old Testament from their thorough knowledge of Palestine and the farther East. My self-respect, as well as my sense of fitness, warned me off this ground, which it would have been presumptuous in me to forestall, and thus provoke a fatal comparison. I saw therefore, that I must confine myself to the New Testament. But even here I found a rigid fence which I could not overstep. At the Reading Congress a year ago a paper was read on this very subject by an able Oxford

Professor—avowedly a continuation of an inaugural lecture which he had recently delivered in the University. In these two papers he traversed the whole ground up to the date of the last Congress, and no more competent guide in this province could be found. The term “recent” therefore, though sufficiently elastic in itself, must receive a very strict interpretation from me. I am constrained to confine myself to the discoveries published within the last twelve months. But I take courage in a prophetic passage which I find in the able and exhaustive summary by Professor Sanday, to which I have already referred. “After all,” he writes, “we are only picking up the gleanings of bygone ages. We are not reaping a harvest on virgin soil, and yet of late the very gleanings have been so rich, that we cannot refrain from hoping that those which lie before us in the immediate future may be not less so.” This hope has not been disappointed. Having thus restricted the sphere of discussion, I shall confine myself to two recent discoveries of great interest and importance for the earliest history of Christianity.

I. I will ask you first to accompany me to Asia Minor. It is plain that the students of early Christian history are yet very far from recognising the extreme importance of a thorough investigation of this region. Otherwise there would be no lack of funds to sustain such explorations as those carried on by Mr. Wood at Ephesus and Mr. Ramsay in Phrygia. Asia Minor was the principal scene of St. Paul’s missionary labours; it was likewise the chief focus of Christian thought and action in the second century. Yet Asia Minor teems with undiscovered records of the past. It would only be an innocent exaggeration if I were to say that every spadeful of soil turned up would reveal some secret of Antiquity. It should be remembered also that in these regions Christianity courted publicity with a boldness of face which it did not venture to assume elsewhere. Thus we may expect to find there not a few memorials of the earliest Christian times buried under the accumulated rubbish of ages. Even where no distinct Christian records are attainable, the contemporary heathen monuments have often the highest value in verifying, interpreting, and illustrating the notices in the Bible, or in early Christian history. Let me give one single illustration, showing how an accidental discovery, trivial in itself and apparently alien to all the interests of the ecclesiastical historian, may lead to results of the highest moment. Among the stones disinterred a few years ago by Mr. Wood at Ephesus was one containing the name and date of a certain obscure proconsul, Julianus. Now this proconsul happens to be mentioned in the heathen rhetorician Aristides. Thus M. Waddington was enabled to correct and revise the chronology of Aristides’ life. But it so happens that Aristides elsewhere refers to another proconsul, Quadratus—the same who presided at the martyrdom of Polycarp. Accordingly M. Waddington fixed the time of Polycarp’s death some twelve years before the received date, and the inferential consequences, as affecting Polycarp’s relations with St. John, and thus bearing on the continuity of Church doctrine and practice, have the highest value. More recently the labours of Mr. Ramsay, who has explored the comparatively untroubled regions of Phrygia with the eye of a scholar and antiquarian, have thrown a flood of light on the ecclesiastical arrangements of the district; and still greater things may yet be expected from their continuance, if

the necessary funds are forthcoming. In the course of one season he discovered not less than a dozen Christian monumental inscriptions belonging to the second and third centuries, and dating from the reign of Hadrian onward. To one of these sepulchral inscriptions, second to no early monument of Christianity in interest, I desire to direct your attention. Though not having a very immediate bearing on the Scriptures, yet indirectly, as indicating the common beliefs and practices of the Christians in these early ages, it has the highest significance. In the spurious “Life of Abercius,” Bishop of Hieropolis, as given by the Metaphrast, an inscription is incorporated professing to have been written by the saint for his tomb in his own lifetime. Though much corrupted, and written continuously as if it were prose, it is easily seen to fall into hexameter verses. In the course of his explorations in 1883 Mr. Ramsay discovered *in situ* a portion of this very epitaph inscribed on an altar-shaped tomb, not however at Hierapolis on the Mæander, but at Hieropolis, a more obscure city near Synnada. As it answers in all other respects to the notices in the “Life of Abercius,” Hierapolis in the existing text of this life is plainly a corruption for Hieropolis. Thus, from being merely a critical puzzle, this epitaph henceforward ranks as an historical monument. Though comprising only twenty-two lines, it is full of matter illustrating the condition and usages of the Church in the latter half of the second century. Abercius declares himself to be a disciple of the pure Shepherd, who feeds his flocks on mountains and plains. This Shepherd is described as having great eyes which look on every side. As we read this description, we may well imagine it drawn from some pictorial representation of the Good Shepherd which the writer had seen in the Roman catacombs or elsewhere. But however this may be, the underlying theology and the reference to the imagery in St. John’s Gospel will be obvious. The author says likewise that the Shepherd taught him “faithful writings,” meaning doubtless the Evangelical narratives and the Apostolic Epistles. He further sent him to royal Rome, where he saw the golden-robed, golden-sandalled queen, and a people wearing a bright seal. The queen and the seal have been interpreted literally—the one being identified with Faustina, the consort of Marcus Aurelius, and the other explained of the signet rings worn by the higher orders, the senators and knights, among the Romans. On the foundation of this supposed interview with the Empress a legendary story, full of portentous miracles, has been piled. But we can hardly be wrong in giving a figurative explanation to these incidents in accordance with the general character of the epitaph. The queen will then be the Church of the imperial city, and the people wearing the seal will be the Christian brethren signed by baptism. The writer further tells us that he went to Syria, and crossed the Euphrates, visiting Nisibis. Everywhere he found comrades—that is, fellow-Christians. Faith led the way, and following her guidance he took Paul for his companion—or, in other words, the Epistles of the Apostle were his constant study. Wherever he went his guide set before him for food, fish from the fountain. The fountain here, it is hardly necessary to say, is baptism, and the fish is the divine ΙΧΘΥΣ—Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour; so that this is probably the earliest example of the acrostic which afterwards became common. This fish is further described as “exceeding large and clean,” and

as having been "grasped by a pure virgin." Faith gives this fish to her "friends to eat continually, offering good wine, and giving a mixed cup with bread." It is needless to dwell on the picture which is here presented. The miraculous Incarnation, the omniscient, omnipresent energy of Christ, the Scriptural writings, the two sacraments, the extension and catholicity of the Church—all stand out in definite outline and vivid colours, only the more striking, because this is no systematic exposition of the theologian, but the chance expression of a devout Christian soul. A light is thus flashed in upon the inner life of the Christian Church in this remote Phrygian city. But I would call your attention more especially to two points. *First*, the writer describes himself as in his seventy-second year when he composes this epitaph. If it was written, as there is good reason to believe, as early as the reign of Commodus, or perhaps even earlier, he must have been born not later than about A.D. 120—some twenty years after the death of St. John, who passed the last decades of his life in Ephesus, the capital of this same province. Thus he would be reared amidst the still fresh traditions of the last surviving Apostle. *Secondly*, he visits the far West and the far East, and everywhere he finds not only the same Church and the same sacraments, but also, as we may infer from his language, the same, or substantially the same, theology. His faith was the faith of the Catholic Church. In this monument then we have another stubborn protest against certain modern theories. Each fresh discovery has been a fresh nail driven into the coffin of Tübingen speculation.

2. From this interesting monumental epitaph I turn to a record of a wholly different kind. When, in the year 1875, Bryennios, then Bishop of Serræ, published for the first time, from a manuscript at Constantinople, the two Epistles of Clement complete, he gave a list of the other contents of the same volume. Among these was a work entitled, "The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles." As a work of this name is mentioned by Eusebius and others among early apocryphal writings, a hope was excited in the minds of those interested in such studies, that this might be the book alluded to, and that it would throw some light on the vexed question of the origin of the "Apostolical Constitutions." Eight or nine years, however, elapsed, and no more was heard of it. At length, at the close of last year (1883), it was given to the world. Its interest and importance have far exceeded our highest expectations. It is found indeed to be the basis of the seventh book of the "Apostolical Constitutions;" but this is the smallest item in our gain. Its chief value consists in the light which it throws on the condition of the infant Church. We are met, however, with this preliminary difficulty, that it does not carry its date on its face, and we must have recourse to critical inferences in establishing its age. There can be little or no question, however, that it is not only the work mentioned by Eusebius, but also the work quoted by Clement of Alexandria as "scripture." In the absence of any direct indication, it has been placed as late as A.D. 140-160 by Bryennios, but I do not doubt that we should be more near the mark in dating it, with most English and some German critics, somewhere between A.D. 80-110. The reasons are briefly these. In the first place, the Eucharist still remains part of the *Agape*. This follows from the fact that in connection with the Eucharistic prayers directions are

given about what is to be done when the persons present "are filled," "are satisfied." But the separation of the two seemed to have taken place about the time of the Bithynian persecution under Pliny (A.D. 112); and in the age of Justin Martyr they are evidently distinct. In the corresponding passage of the later work, the "Apostolical Constitutions," the words "after they are filled" are replaced by "after their participation," the alteration of usage requiring an alteration of phrase." Again the picture which it exhibits of the Christian ministry suggests a very early date. The points to be observed are twofold. First, as in St. Paul's account in the First Epistle to the Corinthians and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, so here also, we have both an itinerant and a localised ministry—the former consisting mainly, of apostles and prophets, and the functions of the two shading off into one another, so that it is not easy to draw the line between them; and, secondly, the localised ministry is confined to two orders, who are called bishops and deacons, as in the Epistle to the Philippians and elsewhere in the Apostolic writings. Here again the comparison with the "Apostolical Constitutions" is suggestive. Where our document has "bishops and deacons," the later work in the corresponding passage substitutes "bishops, presbyters, and deacons." Thus, when our author wrote, "bishop" still remained a synonym for "presbyter," and the episcopal office, properly so called, was not yet constituted in the district in which he lived. Now there is no distinct trace of this first state of things—the itinerant ministry side by side with the localised—after the Apostolic writings, not even in the Apostolic Fathers; while as regards the second point—the identity of meaning in the terms "bishop" and "presbyter"—the latest example is found in Clement's Epistle, which was written about A.D. 95; and in Asia Minor and Syria, at all events, episcopacy proper was a recognised institution when Ignatius wrote in the early years of the second century. As our work, however, may with some probability be assigned to Alexandria—for all its affinities are Alexandrian—and the march of events was probably not so rapid there as elsewhere, we may perhaps allow the latitude of a few years more. But, it will be urged, the description of the "two ways," with which it commences, is obviously plagiarised from the Epistle of Barnabas, and this Epistle cannot be placed as early as this date as the plagiarist would require. In replying to this objection, I would altogether waive the question respecting the date of the Epistle of Barnabas, though I might have something to say on that point. But when I find two sets of critics, each maintaining with equal confidence and with some show of reason, the one that Barnabas borrows from the "Doctrine," the other that the "Doctrine" is indebted to Barnabas, a third solution is suggested to my mind as more probable than either. May it not have been that neither author plagiarises from the other, but that both derive the matter which they have in common from a third source? The idea of the two ways was familiar to Greek philosophers. May not some pious Jew then have taken up this idea and interwoven into it the moral code of the Old Testament, writing perhaps under the mask of a heathen philosopher, who thus was made an unwilling witness to the superiority of Jewish ethics? The adoption of a heathen pseudonym was not an uncommon device with the literary Jew before and about the time of the Christian era, as, for instance, in the maxims of the pseudo-Phocylides and

the predictions of the pseudo-Sibyllines. The early date which I venture to assign to the "Doctrine of the Apostles" agrees well with its general character. There is an archaic simplicity—I had almost said a childishness—in its practical directions which is only consistent with the early infancy of a Church. Such, for instance, is the test which it suggests of truth and falsehood. A true apostle, says the writer, will only remain in a place a single day or two at most; if a man who sets up for an apostle stays a third, he is a false prophet. Of the genuineness of this document there can be no shadow of doubt. No one could or would have forged it. It serves no party interests; it pleases nobody; it is neither sacramentarian nor anti-sacramentarian, neither sacerdotal nor anti-sacerdotal, but both (at least in appearance) by turns. We may therefore safely use it as a witness; but, while doing so, we must be careful not to attribute to it an authority to which it lays no claim. It pleads no official sanction. Its title is not intended to suggest its authorship. We may accept it as the private venture of some one who desires to set forth his views on moral conduct and Church order, believing them to represent the mind of the Apostles. But at the same time such a document cannot but reflect fairly well the beliefs and usages of the writer's age and country. A further caution is likewise needed. It does not profess to be complete. Its desultory character is apparent, for instance, in the description of the Eucharistic service, which is plainly fragmentary. We cannot therefore safely draw inferences from its silence. This remark applies especially to doctrine, of which it says next to nothing. Observing these cautions, we interrogate it with regard to the New Testament writings. And here the answer is unexpectedly full. The writer quotes large portions of St. Matthew. The Lord's Prayer is given at length; numerous sayings from the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere are introduced; the baptismal formula is quoted. Occasionally also we come across echoes of the characteristic language of St. Luke, as for instance, "What thank have ye, if ye love them that love you" (sec. 1); and again, "Let not your lamps be quenched nor your loins ungirt, but be ready, for ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh" (sec. 16). On the other hand the coincidences with St. John are less close. The writer speaks of "the holy vine of David;" he uses the expression "perfect in love;" and in a third passage his language is the echo of an injunction in St. John's Second Epistle. These, however, though indicating a sympathy with St. John's modes of thought, are not decisive as to a knowledge of his writings. Nor, indeed, if we are right in assigning a very early date to this document, are we justified in expecting such knowledge. With St. Paul's Epistles, again, the writer shows an acquaintance. Coincidences with four of these—Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and 2 Thessalonians, indicate a free use of the Apostle's writings. We likewise meet with the precept, "Abstain from fleshly and bodily lusts," which seems to be taken from 1 Pet. ii. 11, but may possibly be independent. The testimony, however, is not confined to the passages actually quoted. The prominence given here, as in the epitaph of Abercius, to the two sacraments, to these and these only, is the proper sequel to the Lord's parting commands as related in the Gospels. The picture of the Christian ministry again is the continuation of the state of things represented in St. Paul's Epistles. Remember-

ing that the whole work occupies only a little more than six octavo pages, we are surprised at the amount of testimony—certainly much more than we had any right to expect—which it bears to the canon of the New Testament. Moreover, its evidence has a negative value also. In his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," Dr. Westcott has brought together all the traditional sayings of Christ, and the result shows how very little was reported outside the canonical Gospels. This result is confirmed by the document before us. It contains, indeed, one quotation of which the source is not known, a prudential maxim of almsgiving introduced with the words, "It has been said;" but we have no ground for supposing this to be given as a saying of Christ. All the evangelical matter, so far as we can trace it, is found within the four corners of our canonical Gospels.

These are the gleanings—neither meagre nor unimportant, I venture to think—which a single year has yielded in this portion of our field. (Cheers.)



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1884.

RESULTS OF RECENT HISTORICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH UPON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

A MOST interesting and valuable Conference on the above subject was one of the best parts of the programme of the Carlisle Church Congress. The discussion began with a paper by the learned Bishop of Durham, who, confining himself to the results of recent research upon the New Testament, dealt with two remarkable "Finds," viz.—1st. An epigraph supposed to have been written by Abercius, Bishop of Hierapolis, for his own tomb, and (2ndly) the work known as the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles." Respecting the first of these, the Bishop said that Mr. Ramsay, in the course of his explorations in 1883, discovered *in situ* a portion of this very epitaph on an altar-tomb at Hierapolis. Though comprising only twenty-two lines, it is full of matter illustrating the condition and usages of the church of the second century. The inscription is couched in metaphorical language—e.g., Abercius describes himself as "a disciple of the pure Shepherd, who feeds his flocks on mountains and plains. He visited Royal Rome and crossed the Euphrates to

Nisibis. Faith led the way, and following her guidance he took Paul for his companion. Wherever he went his guide set before him for food fish from the fountain." This figurative language, the Bishop explains to mean that the Epistles of St. Paul were his constant study, that the fountain is baptism, and the fish the divine $\text{IXOY}\Sigma$, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour; so that this is perhaps the earliest example of the Acrostic, which afterwards became so common. The Holy Communion is also referred to thus:—"Faith gives this fish to her friends to eat continually, offering good wine and giving a mixed cup with bread." The bishop sums up the whole evidence of the inscription thus:—"It is needless to dwell on the picture which is here presented. The miraculous Incarnation, the omniscient, omnipresent energy of Christ, the Scriptural writings, the two sacraments, the extension and catholicity of the Church—all stand out in definite outline and vivid colours, only the more striking because this is no systematic exposition of the theologian, but the chance expression of a devout Christian soul." The date, A.D. 192, is assigned by Dr. Lightfoot to this monument, and he adds it is "another stubborn protest against certain modern theories of early Christian history. Each fresh discovery is a fresh nail driven into the coffin of Tübingen speculation." With regard to the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles," with which many of our readers must be tolerably familiar, Dr. Lightfoot dates it somewhere between A.D. 80 and 110. For doing so he assigns several reasons, which strike us as forcible, viz., that in it the Eucharist still remains part of the Agape,—its picture of the Christian ministry,—its archaic simplicity. "*Of the genuineness of this document,*" says the Bishop, "*there can be no shadow of doubt.*" Let us note now the great importance of this, for a document undeniably genuine, and dated by so competent a scholar between A.D. 80 and 110, if interrogated about the New Testament, must, if it replies at all, reply in a most valuable manner. And here the answer is unexpectedly full. "The writer quotes large portions of St. Matthew, the Lord's Prayer is given at length, numerous sayings from the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere are introduced, the baptismal formula is quoted, and occasionally also we come across echoes of the characteristic language of St. Luke. With St. Paul's Epistles the writer shows an acquaintance; coincidences with four of these—Romans, 1 Cor., Ephesians, and 2 Thess., indicate a free use of the Apostle's writings." "Remembering," adds Dr. Lightfoot, "that the whole work comprises only a little more than six octavo pages, we are surprised at the amount of testimony—certainly much more than we had any right to expect—which it bears to the Canon of the New Testament." It seems to us that this is a matter of the very greatest value, and one for which we have much reason to feel deeply

thankful. To quote the concluding words of the learned prelate—"These are the gleanings, neither meagre nor unimportant I venture to think, which a single year has yielded in this portion of our field." Our readers will find the Bishop's paper *in extenso* in another portion of our columns, and we hope the above outline may induce them to study it in full as it deserves. Dr. Lightfoot is "a scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, who bringeth forth out of his treasures things new and old."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REFUSING THE HOLY COMMUNION.

SIR,—May I ask you to publish the following correspondence between the Bishop of Bedford and myself?

ALFRED COLE.

66, BRIDPORT PLACE, HOXTON, N.,
November 14, 1884.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

Since I wrote you last week, I find that you have selected St. John's at Hackney for your personal "mission" work. That being the case, I consider it my duty to inform you that your "mission" will be unfinished should you fail to bring again to the Holy Communion members of the Church of England who have married their deceased wife's sisters.

I have already told you that the "tables of kindred and affinity" bound up in the covers of the Prayer Book, have never been made either the law of the "Church," or the law of the "State." The Convocation of 1603, it is true, adopted them; but you know it is also true, that the "Canons of 1603" are not binding upon the laity at all; and you cannot point to any Church Council which has made Archbishop Parker's "Tables" the law of the Church. Had there been such a law, the Bishop of St. Albans could not have permitted Mr. Hobson, of Epping, to receive the Holy Communion. With regard, then, to the law of the Church, clergymen are acting illegally in refusing the Holy Communion to any man who has married his deceased wife's sister. The State was supposed to prohibit the marriage by the 5th and 6th William IV., c. 54 (1835), but Lord Lyndhurst's Act was framed like "Shylock's bond," for it omits to state who are the "persons" in the "prohibited degrees," or where a list of such "persons" is to be found; therefore it means nothing. Mr. Murray, Secretary of the Marriage Law Defence Union, has not thought it wise to refer to Lord Lyndhurst's Act in answer to my letters, but he falls back upon the 28th, Henry VIII., c. 7, as containing the "prohibited degrees" of the "State," and he would be right if Mary I., in 1553 and 1554-5 had not repealed this statute, and Elizabeth, in 1558-9, had not confirmed the repeal. If the 28th Henry VIII., c. 7, had not been repealed, then the marriage of a man with his own daughter would have been perfectly legal, for such was Henry VIII.'s interpretation of the "Levitical degrees."

There is only one way out of this difficulty, that is by taking the following sentence in the 32nd Henry VIII., c. 38, to be the "prohibited degrees" of the "Church and State":—

"That from the 1st July, 1540, all and every such marriages, as within the Church of England shall be contracted between lawful persons (as by this Act we declare all persons to be lawful, that be not prohibited by God's law to marry)."

Several passages of Scripture have been thought by some persons to prohibit the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, but not one of these passages will bear the "test" placed upon the interpretation of Scripture by the 20th Article of Religion of our Church, which says:—

"No portion of Scripture is to be interpreted so as to be repugnant to another." I have shown the Bishop of Oxford, Canon Trevor, and others, that every one of the passages they use in support of their arguments will not bear this "test."

The favourite way of many of the bishops and clergy is to refer their opponents to the "law courts" when they differ from them upon the question of refusing the Holy Communion to those who have married their deceased wives' sisters.

The "law courts" might be the proper place to discuss such a question if the Church of England was a political club and the Holy Communion a "club supper." Besides, in order to bring the question into a law court, the man must present himself at the Holy Communion Table and be refused in the presence of witnesses, which would, to my mind, destroy the pure and holy calm of the service altogether. Such being my opinion, I would prefer never receiving the Holy Communion again rather than upset the peace of mind of any clergyman at such a service, neither do I care to go up the "back stairs," or in other words, take the advice of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and "go to some church where I am not known."

When I made what I can prove to be one of the happiest of second marriages, and married my deceased wife's sister, I resigned the superintendency of a Church Sunday School, because I would not place any responsibility upon the vicar, and since that time I have refrained from troubling any clergyman respecting the Holy Communion.

But now that I find you are engaged in a "special mission," it does seem to me the proper time to place upon you the responsibility of inviting me to, or refusing me, the Holy Communion. Should you refuse me, and I hereafter turn my back upon the Church of England, the responsibility will be yours, for I am willing to come, and you have no law of the Church by which to refuse me, but I shall only come in peace, or not at all.

As I hope to get this letter published, will you kindly write me before the "mission" is over?

I am, etc.,

ALFRED COLE.

To the Right Reverend
THE BISHOP OF BEDFORD.

November 20, 1884.

MY DEAR SIR,

I can hardly agree with you that a mission is a favourable opportunity for such an appeal as yours. My time is so fully occupied that I am compelled to make a very brief reply. I have waited till I could hear from the Bishop of St. Albans as to the case of Mr. Hobson. This case turned upon the date of his second marriage, which seems to have been long ago, and at a time when the law was uncertain. The Bishop of St. Albans says the case is quite exceptional, and in no way governs his ordinary advice and practice. My own conviction being that the law of Church as well as State is clear as to the illegality of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, I have no choice in the matter, and, however painful it may be, must reply to your appeal by saying that I could not knowingly admit you to Holy Communion.

I have deep sympathy with those who believe they have contracted such unions lawfully and righteously. I do not judge any one, and especially do I feel the pain of such an answer as I have been obliged to give to one who writes so considerately, and with so much right feeling as to the sanctity of the Holy Communion.

WM. WALSHAM BEDFORD,
Bishop Suffragan for East London.

To ALFRED COLE, Esq.

P.S.—You are quite at liberty to publish this with your own letter.

November 27, 1884.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

I thank you for your very courteous letter of the 20th inst., and I trust that you will take this letter as addressed to the bishops collectively, rather than to yourself individually; for I would gladly spare you any pain, had there been open to me any other way of exposing the ignorance, and blindness of heart of the bishops and the clergy, concerning the marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

The Mission I had thought was not only to draw to the Church those who had never before belonged to her, but also to draw her own members into closer communion. And as a member of the Church of England, without any settled place of worship, living in a parish where my presence would be distasteful to the clergy (although the vicar has admitted to me some ignorance upon the question), I did certainly think "the Mission" the proper time to place upon a bishop the responsibility of inviting me to, or refusing me, the Holy Communion. I have at one time or another written to all the bishops, and I am bound to write that not one of them has told me that I have written at a convenient time. The truth is their view of the question will not bear the light of truth upon it. You have refused me that which our Saviour gave to all His disciples, even to Judas, so that you neither have His word nor His example for so doing. Had I received it unworthily that would have been my sin; but it is your sin to refuse me. But why should I mind? My Saviour was again and again driven out of the Synagogue by the *Chief Priests* and *Scribes*, and every insult placed upon Him by the *Shepherds of the Church*.

You state "that the marriage is illegal by the law of the Church;" would it not have been better to have told me what law of the Church, when made, and if that law of the Church was binding upon the laity? Again and again I am told that this marriage is forbidden by the Church, but from the Archbishop to the curate no one has dared to show by what law of the Church, neither have they attempted to show that the Canons of 1603 are binding upon the laity. On the other hand even the *Church Times*, which has been most bitter against the Deceased Wife's Sisters Bill, stated on December 14, 1883, that—"The Canons of 1603, not having been confirmed by Parliament, do not *proprio vigore* bind the laity. In England the confirmation by Parliament is necessary for any ordinances which are to bind the laity."

Mr. Edward Clarke very clearly proved to the House of Commons, on May 6, 1884, that there was no law of the Church against the marriage. He said:—"It was said that such marriages were forbidden by the Canon law, but he thought that there was a misapprehension with regard to that which the hon. member (Colonel Milne-Home) called the Canon law. The Canon law was one thing and the Canons Ecclesiastical were another. The Canon law contained no such provision as this. The Canons Ecclesiastical did undoubtedly contain a prohibition in a very peculiar form. It declared that these marriages were forbidden by the word of God, and it declared this, as he believed, without the smallest foundation at all. (Cheers.) But what were the Canons Ecclesiastical? They were a series of orders issued by the authority of the Crown upon the concurrence and advice of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, but they were not binding by the law of England upon the laity at all, and were constantly set aside by the bishops and the clergy themselves. (Cheers.)"

The statement has never been denied either in or out of Parliament, by either bishops, clergymen, or laymen.

Right Reverend Sir, you have refused me the Holy Communion upon the ground that my marriage is against the law of the Church, while you know that the law of the Church, to which you refer, is in no way binding upon me a layman. Such a decision but ill becomes a bishop. To refuse so sacred a service upon such a broken reed as the Canons of 1603 is but bad Christianity.

You write me that "Mr. Hobson's case turned upon the

date of his second marriage," and that "the Bishop of St. Albans says his case is quite exceptional, and in no way governs his ordinary advice and practice." Then I am to understand that the refusing the Holy Communion rests entirely upon Lord Lyndhurst's Act of Parliament; and that the bishops consider that such a marriage contracted since 8 a.m. on September 1, 1835, to be unlawful and wrong in God's sight; but that had it taken place twenty-one hours before, or at 11 a.m. on August 31, 1835, then the marriage would have been lawful and right in God's sight. I blush that any bishop can pretend to be guided by a mere Act of Parliament upon such a question as that of refusing the Holy Communion. Yet this it seems is the case, for such marriages are solemnised by clergymen of the Church of England in nearly all, if not all, our English colonies; those men are given the Holy Communion, both in the colonies and in this country; those married before September 1, 1835, the Bishop of St. Albans has already told us "cannot legally be refused the Holy Communion;" yet in my case you pretend that legally I can be refused. And why? Because an Act of Parliament was passed to establish the son of one of the lords firmly in his title of succession. And the Act itself (5th and 6th William IV. c. 54)—how any learned man can pretend that "the prohibited degrees," spoken of by that Act, can mean the "Tables" published in the covers of the Prayer-book is to me a mystery. The Marriage Law Defence Union, in their Tract No. VI., state—"The Table is in the Prayer-book; but it is no part of the Prayer-book, since it did not appear in the sealed copies which represented the book as it was sanctioned by Convocation in 1602." In no way have these "Tables" been confirmed by Parliament, and I defy you to produce any such law of the State. "The prohibited degrees," spoken of by Lord Lyndhurst's Act, I maintain require the existence in some former Act of Parliament of "the prohibited degrees," and Mr. Murray, secretary of the Marriage Law Defence Union, in answer to my letter in *Lloyds' Newspaper*, tries to make an Act of Parliament, which has been repealed 331 years, produce "the prohibited degrees" spoken of by Lord Lyndhurst's Act. Should he be right that "the prohibited degrees" are in the 28th Henry VIII. c. 7, then the bishops are defending a law which makes it perfectly legal for a man to marry his own daughter; for such was Henry VIII.'s pure interpretation of "The Levitical degrees."

In your sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday morning you spoke of faith in God as being the very first principle in religion. In my marriage such a faith has been my strong tower. I have asked Canon Trevor, through the *Hereford Times*, if he could point to any dying saint whom we might read of in the Bible, who was permitted by our Heavenly Father to express any dying wish or blessing that would lead their most loved friends into sin. The Canon's silence is another small proof that at death the dying saints are so near the gate of Heaven and their Saviour's presence, that no such wish has ever been uttered. My faith in God is that he being the same God, unchangeable for ever, has led me to take my dying wife's wish, as being right in His sight. And had I needed any confirmation that the marriage was right in God's sight, a few weeks since my darling boy left this life for Our Father's Home, and only one hour before his Saviour called him to join his mother in Heaven, that dear boy thanked in words and looks his step-mother, his own mother's sister, for all the love and kindness she had shown to him. The mother asked, the son thanked, both died trusting in Jesus.

Again, it is written, "A prudent wife is from the Lord." Am I to believe these words to be God's words? If so I have a prudent wife in my deceased wife's sister. "A friend loveth at all times," "A friend sticketh closer than a brother." "Faithful are the wounds of a friend." My best earthly friends, clergymen of the Church of England, members of the Church of England, could not tell me that one word of the Bible was against the marriage, while many advised me to make the marriage. Of this I am certain, that where there are children by the first wife, the deceased wife's sister makes the best step-mother to the children.

I have written more than I at first intended, but this will possibly be the last letter that I shall write as a member of the Church of England, so I have somewhat written my mind upon the subject. It is now my intention of seeking outside the Church of England some congregation of Christians who have a better way of interpreting God's Word than by an Act of Parliament.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, June 12, 1883, stated what I believe to be the real objection to the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. He said:—"To pass to another point—is there no consideration whatever to be extended to the clergy themselves in their intercourse with the people? The clergy, the teachers of the people, had been taught to believe that by the law of England, by the Prayer Book, by the Canons of the Church, these marriages are forbidden by Scripture. Suppose this Bill passes, what is their position at once as representing Scripture? I do not say merely as expositors, but as men who have always been taught to receive it as the law of the realm that these marriages were not according to Scripture? It is absolutely certain that, upon such pressure as is now brought to bear, the clergy are to be entirely unconsidered. It would be impossible that any reflecting man could really think that the English clergy, as representing the whole body of the laity, could possibly abandon their privileged standing-point."

Such a doctrine of no repentance, no amendment, no reform of a law introduced into the Statute Book, by such a man as Henry VIII., very ill becomes an Archbishop.

The clergy do not represent the laity upon this question, and the clergy themselves would care but little for "their privileged standing-point" were it not that their bread and cheese depend so much upon the bishops. The preferences in the gift of those bishops who in 1833 voted against the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill number at least 1,500. This I do know, that many clergymen of the Church of England have written and told me in confidence, that they do not agree with this prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. I write this latter part of my letter upon the general assumption that the marriage is illegal, but personally I contend that there is no law of *Church or State* against the marriage, at any rate no one has yet been able to show me any such law.

I am, etc.,

To the Right Reverend ALFRED COLE.
THE BISHOP OF BEDFORD.

December 8, 1884.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

Since I wrote you on November 27, I have found that the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission Report states that the Canons of 1603-4 "are regarded as not binding upon the laity;" also in the appendix to that "Report" is cited the case of *Middleton v. Crofts*, in 1736, in which Lord Hardwicke gave judgment—"That the Canons of 1603, not having been confirmed by Parliament, do not *propria vigore* bind the laity." I write you again so that you may fully know that you have no law of the Church to justify your refusing me the Holy Communion. I have therefore decided to remain in the Church of England and claim my rights as a layman.

ALFRED COLE.

To the BISHOP OF BEDFORD.

SIR,—The Bishop of Oxford tells those who can receive it, that he would rather see 200,000 Frenchmen land at Dover than see the marriage with a deceased wife's sister legalised! *Scripta verba manent*, but the bishop is safe in uttering such nonsense. England's sons are not likely to place in jeopardy England's wives and daughters, and consign them to 200,000 Frenchmen, if they landed at Dover, and please God they never will. The Englishman's ideas on the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill are not likely to be

influenced by any such oratorical flights as the Bishop of Oxford's latest any more than by his former efforts of reasoning out this matter.

CANTAB.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN ?

SIR,—Resuming my argument from my last letter, I wish to point out that none of those Apocryphal Gospels I named, nor any other spurious gospels, acts, epistles, revelations, and liturgies of the primitive church, which Fabricius carefully collected, “speak disrespectfully of Christ, of His religion and apostles” (Murdock). Inventions doubtless, but not malignant inventions like the anti-evangels of the Talmud. Their *bona fides* was as great as that of the Hebrew and Greek writers of previous ages, whose works are found in the O. T. Canon and in the Apocrypha; as great as the more numerous pseud-epigraphical works, like the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Ascension of Isaiah, &c., which courted admittance into the Hebrew Canon. Comparing these writings with the spurious Gospels, &c., of the Christian period, we may notice a common honesty of purpose, and withal a common practice of personating some departed saint, or of writing in some well-known name. There was no dishonesty in a practice so general and so enduring. It did not strike them, at least, as dishonest. On the strength of it, several minor writings have passed into our Christian Canon. The Apostles’ Creed and the “Apostolic Constitutions” did not proceed from the apostles, nor had they a hand in writing the “Teaching of the Twelve.” The names of Barnabas, Clement and Ignatius, apostolic fathers, were conveniently used by authors of spurious epistles who have withheld their own. Interpolations, emendations and unauthorised additions to received works were probably still more numerous. Origen traced them in the LXX., the Bible of early Christianity, and both Jerome and Epiphanius assert that the orthodox did not hesitate to amend their Gospels, if they thought there were passages in them objectionable or doubtful. Our Bible still exhibits three well-known unauthentic additions to the text, to say nothing of false subscriptions to the Epistles. If in addition to these common, but misguiding literary habits, we add the acknowledged fact, that a deep cloud hangs over the history of the Church from the close of the Book of Acts to Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, we have the best of reasons for hesitation in accepting later traditions, concerning the authorship of the Gospels, as sober fact. The oldest tradition concerning this authorship is that of Irenæus towards the end of the second century. It comes too late for certainty. It springs from a people whose ideas of literary honesty were unconsciously vitiated. In the case of the first and third Gospels, a tetralogy and trilogy respectively, his statements do not accord with the facts of the case. Luke, for instance, did not “put down in a book the Gospel preached by Paul,” as Irenæus asserts, for Paul could not have used the identical words of the “common tradition,” the ground work of the Synoptic Gospels, nor what common arrangement survives in them. Paul’s Gospel was clearly his Christology and the doctrines which are associated with his name. But we can see how the tradition of Irenæus arose. It is beyond

dispute that the finger mark of Paul is in the third Gospel. It owes to him its colour and reflects his teaching. Moreover his great antagonist, Peter, had his Gospel, viz., that to the Hebrews, Paul therefore must have his. Accordingly a tradition arose which the historian Eusebius thought worth recording (Ecc. History, iii. 4), viz., “that Paul usually referred to the Gospel of Luke, whenever in the epistles he spoke of some particular Gospel of his own, saying ‘according to my Gospel.’” How easy for so impossible a tradition to develop into that of Irenæus that “Luke put down in a book the Gospel preached by Paul,” I need not stop to point out. The statement of Irenæus, concerning the Gospel of Matthew, is less obviously in error, although it is linked with the tradition that “Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome,” a tradition which had its birth in the reconciliation of the two great opposing parties in the Christian Church, the Pauline and the Petrine. Nazarene Christians, as Irenæus and Theodoret tell us, regarded Paul as an apostate. In the Clementine Homilies, he is likened to Simon Magus. The Recognitions tell a tale of his encountering James, the brother of the Lord, throwing him downstairs and beating him nearly to death. An apocryphal letter of St. Peter, dating from the second century, speaks of Paul as “the enemy preaching a doctrine at once foolish and lawless.” The exaggerations, recriminations, and anathemas of their followers intensified the differences between those apostles, of which we catch a glimpse in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians. It was probably the fear of a schism in the Church which drew from St. John, in his first general epistle, the imploring cry for brotherly love, an epistle which insists equally on the keeping God’s commandments and the divine birth of faith. The second of Peter has this conciliatory tendency still more pronounced. The Acts of the Apostles, read in the light of this reconciliation, draw a parallel between Peter and Paul, with similarities of gifts and of miraculous powers; Paul utters Petrine sentiments and Peter’s speeches have a Pauline character. I do not say that the author gave the rein to his imagination, but I do say that a conciliatory tendency, especially in the selection of facts and the colouring of the speeches, best explains the peculiarities of that book. Sober critics assert that the impulse for reconciliation given by St. John was followed by the compiler of the third Gospel. They maintain that there is every reason to believe that this Gospel went through considerable alteration under the influence of St. John. Its character is Pauline, comprehensive and conciliatory, as compared with the more legally strict, Judaistic and Messianic Gospel of Matthew. This Gospel, presenting less complex features, was probably earlier in date. It seems to have been better known and more frequently quoted. Papias knew of Matthew and of Mark’s Gospels, but not of Luke’s.

Summing up now this lengthy argument, we have : 1st. Gospels embodying one common tradition with others less widely known. 2nd. No written Gospels named or referred to in any of the undisputed books of the New Testament. 3rd. No Gospels named by the early Fathers till near the end of the second century. 4th. Quotations from apocryphal sources mixed up with others resembling canonical sources. 5th. A large number of spurious Christian writings published in the names of apostles and their disciples. 6th. Some of these are found in our present canon of

the New Testament. 7th. The prevailing custom of tampering with MSS., in the supposed interests of religion. 8th. The Nazarene tendency of Matthew's Gospel and the Pauline tendency of Luke's. 9th. The manifest antagonism of the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Church. 10th. The conciliatory impulse given by John and apparently followed by Luke's Gospel and Acts. 11th. The manifest error of tradition in ascribing Luke's Gospel to Paul; and 12th. The natural tendency of tradition to magnify the origin of its sacred books. All these considerations lead me to conclude that unnamed compilations, like our Synoptic Gospels, are most probably, in their present shape, of a later date than is commonly supposed, and that they belong rather to the first quarter of the second century than to the first.

Having given my unbiassed opinion on "*Erigena's*" question—When were our Gospels written? I now proceed to answer a few objections. Dean Alford's great argument for the date of our Synoptic Gospels, before the Fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, is that the evangelists would surely have mentioned so manifest a fulfilment of prophecy. But this admits of a ready answer. Besides those variations in Luke's Gospel from the older prophetic text of Mark (see Luke xxi. 20 and 24), which, by their greater particularity, imply that knowledge, we have, in the confessedly later Gospel of St. John, no reference whatever to the event itself, much less to its fulfilment of prophecy. None of the early Fathers refer to it either. Dean Alford's argument therefore falls to the ground. His early dates for the two books of Luke rest upon his bare assumption that the book of Acts was written within two years of Paul's arrival at Rome. For this he has not even a scrap of tradition to produce. The fact that the book of Acts breaks off abruptly is perfectly consistent with the MS. in the author's hands, fifty or sixty years afterwards, ending there. The original Gospel of Mark ends even more abruptly. "*Erigena*" relies upon Paley's "*Horæ Paulinæ*" for the early date of the Book of Acts, and he is naturally anxious to make us believe that Luke was not acquainted with Paul's letters. I cannot accept that belief. It seems to me, on the contrary, a preposterous thing that an author should write the biography of another, and yet be unacquainted with his letters. At the same time I do not say that the Acts was based on those letters. I have looked carefully again through Paley's argument in the "*Horæ Paulinæ*," and the early date of the Acts and Gospels is not one of the seven conclusions of his book. He does not pretend to prove that the Acts were written by Luke. He is satisfied with what he calls "the substantial truth of the narration." In his work on the "Evidences of Christianity," he says that the question of genuineness is not essential to his argument. "*Erigena*" is right in saying that the Epistle of Baruch personates the friend of Jeremiah, and the second of Esdras, the elder Ezra. To these personations he might add the Book of Ecclesiastes, written in the name of Solomon, the Book of Daniel (viii. to end), the Epistle of Jeremy and others. In 2 Peter, which he rejects as spurious, the author writes in the name of Peter. But "*Erigena*" is wrong in supposing that his case would not be strengthened by Luke's name appearing in the body of the works attributed to him, and he is certainly weakening his argument for the genuineness of Luke's writings by allowing that a spurious epistle could be admitted into the canon. If, besides, the Epistle to the

Hebrews is not from the pen of Paul, and if the other controverted epistles are also spurious, we have numerous illustrations of non-genuine works admitted into the Bible. Why should we accept as infallibly certain the genuineness of two unnamed MSS. which a late tradition assigned to Luke.

Lastly, with regard to the "we" sections of the Acts, the strongest point of "*Erigena's*" argument, its force is not great enough to overbear the adverse considerations which I have advanced. It is a sufficient answer that the author embodied *bonâ fide*, though in his own language, the MS. notes in the first person which came into his hand. "*Erigena*" makes light of these notes as a controversial flourish; but a little consideration will show that the author of the Acts must have had notes in MS. of that larger part of the narrative of which he was not an eye-witness, or else he drew more largely on his imagination than I should like to think. He had MSS. and tradition for his Gospel and he had other MSS. and other tradition for his Acts. This appears to me reasonable and self-consistent. Moreover the fact of "we" sections occurring in a work, otherwise in the third person, is not confined to the Acts. In Pseudo-Esdras book i. viii. 61-65, a "we" section appears in reference to a journey from Babylon to Jerusalem; in the account of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, a short "we" section appears, and curiously enough, on his voyage to Rome; while another "we" section of greater length appears at § 7. These instances show that no great stress can be laid upon the "we" sections of the Acts.

In concluding the subject, I beg to say that no critic, orthodox or neologian, is able to fix absolutely the date of the Gospels, nor the place where they were written. If we take tradition as our guide, we are led into manifest errors and contradictions. If we reject tradition, partially or totally, we are thrown back upon our personal judgment. That judgment is too often warped by our prepossessions and early education. I am conscious of it myself. But as far as I can give a candid and unbiassed opinion, I will say that the revered Gospels of our holy religion rest upon traditions and MSS. of a very early date, but that their final canonical form is due most probably to the first quarter of the second century.

Since writing the above, I notice "*Erigena's*" reply to my former letter. After reading it carefully, I find that it would take another letter of equal length to answer it adequately, and that would be taxing too much the patience of your readers. Two or three points only will I briefly touch on. 1. "*Erigena*," in striving vigorously for the traditional authorship of the Synoptic Gospels, is quite content to go, in the teeth of the best authenticated tradition, when it appears to suit his purpose. He identifies "John the Presbyter" with John the Apostle, on the authority of Eusebius. Now, not only does Eusebius speak of "John the Presbyter" as "the other John . . . distinguished plainly by the name of Presbyter," but he asserts that "it is particularly necessary to observe that there are also two tombs in Ephesus, and that both are called John's, even to this day." Nothing is clearer than that Eusebius does not identify the two Johns. And, as, of course, "*Erigena*" is well read in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical history, nothing is plainer than that, for the sake of bolstering up a hazy tradition, he rejects a solid one—solid, that is, for a tradition. 2. His idea that the new Mark document arranging chronologically, and connecting the sections of an

older disjointed MS. should result in a new document broadly different in wording and contents, with the "broadly" thrice repeated, is so utterly different from my idea, that he is quite welcome to brand it with his reprobation; only, in the name of fair play, let him not call it mine. And as for the little Christian congregations which had hitherto heard portions of the older MS. read occasionally at their services, they would be only too glad to have its disjointed portions, written perhaps imperfectly, perhaps illegibly, and with numerous abbreviations, digested into a fair, legible, connected and chronological MS., having the same sacred character and, in its descriptive additions embodying probably known verbal tradition. In any community, within the dates I have given for its production, but particularly in such uncritical ones as the early Christian ones confessedly were, such a substitution would be natural and welcome. "*Erigena's*" difficulties here are purely controversial. 3. The similarity of wording of the Lord's Prayer to St. Matthew's Gospel in the "Teaching of the Twelve," does not prove the knowledge of that Gospel by the author of the "Teaching." The reason is obvious. The Lord's prayer would be just the one prayer which would be repeated at all Christian services, and taught catechumens and children. No Gospel would be needed for its transmission and none assuredly was used.

In conclusion, "*Erigena*" refuses to consider the question "When were the Gospels written?" as one which he has undertaken, and therefore, I may add, one that he can solve. With all tradition and documents at his command he cannot fix the date of a single one of the Synoptic Gospels. Nor can anyone else. Such a thing as dating their MSS. never occurred to the earliest Christian writers. Nor did they become writers but, as tradition says, from necessity. This expression cannot fairly include in the first instance finished compositions, like our Gospels. The work was not completed at once. And herein the Moslems can claim for their Corān, edited by Zaid ibn Thābit, the secretary of Mahommed, a closer relation to its source, than our Gospels. But who would become a Mahometan in consequence? Religion does not rest upon the chronology of Apostolic digests, whether late or early. And Luke, on whose behalf the greatest show of reasoning is made, but I believe, inconclusively, is "certainly the latest of the evangelical writers, his Gospel made its way into notice much more slowly than the others" (Reuss). In the oldest western MSS., in the Gothic version and generally in the East, till the fifth century, Luke stood last in the order of the four Evangelists. That the date of his compilation has been so widely regarded as later than John's, is a strong point in favour of my argument. At any rate in weighing with dispassionate calmness probabilities, traditions, and surmises on the one side and on the other, for there is nothing more solid to go upon, the more enlightened of your readers, and eventually "*Erigena*" himself, will allow that, in the dates I have named, I have not exceeded the fair bounds of probability.

F. T. P.

THE KILKENNY CATS.

SIR,—Is there any hope of the controversy on the "Origin of the Gospels" being ended within living memory? At present it seems to "drag with each

remove a lengthening chain." The PULPIT is a small paper, and it is surely unwise to have it so "horribly stuffed" with controversial correspondence of a type that even Robinson Crusoe, in the absence of all other literature on his desert island, would have been unable to digest. The person who can assimilate such effusions must be like Bret Harte's Emu:—

Old saws and gimlets but its appetite whets
Like the world-famous bark of Peru;
There's nothing so hard that the bird will discard,
And nothing its taste will eschew,
That you
Can give that long-legged Emu?

I had hoped that the controversialists would have shared the fate of the Kilkenny cats ere now, but it was a wild delusion. I am thankful I am not the

PRINTER'S DEVIL.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." December, 1884. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

WE greatly regret to see in the preface to the eighth volume, which this number contains, that the *Expositor* will no longer be edited by Dr. Cox. "Both as a literary and a commercial venture," he says, "the *Expositor* has achieved success. But its proprietors conscientiously object (1) to 'the loose views of inspiration' involved in the critical theories of the school of which, for instance, my friend Dr. W. Robertson Smith is a distinguished ornament; (2) to those allusions to 'the larger hope' which occur, e.g., in my own contributions, and to the general tone of thought which a belief in the ultimate salvation of all men inevitably carries with it, and they feel bound to insist on the exclusion of both these objectionable elements from the pages of this magazine." Now we fully admit that in the presence of a "conscientious objection" it is in every respect better that there should be an honourable separation; but we think a "conscientious objection" to "the larger hope," as taught by Dr. Cox is, to say the least, curious. There are ways of teaching what is called "the larger hope" which are wholly objectionable; and in the most objectionable form of a belief in things "coming right," the belief—if it can be called a belief—is held by hundreds of thousands; but when it is taught, as it is taught by Dr. Cox, in combination with a zeal for righteousness as enthusiastic as Isaiah's, why then the "conscientious objection" seems to savour a little of the "conscientious objection" of the prophet Jonah to the non-fulfilment of his prophecy, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed," by reason of the repentance of the Ninevites. And as regards Biblical criticism, do not the proprietors know that free criticism is the best, not to say the only, means of arriving at the truth? We have read, we believe, everything written by Dr. Robertson Smith and by Dr. Cox (except the "Sermons" of the latter) and are quite sure there is not a single irreverent passage in the writings of either, though we quite admit there are many not in accord with popular traditional opinions. Are future contributors to the *Expositor* going to learn from listening to *vox populi*—a *populus* too, that does not read its Bible, but only reads books about it—or are

they going to endeavour to make the voice a little less of an echo? Our remarks have left us little space, but we must not omit to call attention to the very interesting paper by Mr. Deane, on "The Psalter of Solomon," much the best paper in the number.

"UNITY AND CATHOLICITY." A sermon preached on the occasion of the Seabury Centenary, on Sunday, October 5th, 1884, in St. John's Church, Edinburgh, by the Most Rev. Lord Plunket, D.D., Bishop of Meath. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co.; Edinburgh: R. Grant and Son. 1884. Pp. 19.

WE commend to our subscribers and readers in general this very able discourse on the text "Who is my neighbour?" Which contains interesting facts and important lessons. The noble lord is anxious to impress on his hearers "the large-hearted and unselfish love which ought to characterise all who profess to be brethren in the one universal Church of Christ." He brings his sermon to a close by a personal application of the text, reminding his hearers how our blessed Lord is the one true Neighbour to all who feel their need of Him, and also reminding them of our Saviour's tender injunction, "Go thou and do likewise."

THE Bishop of London has named February 23 and 24, 1885, for the meeting of the Diocesan Conference.

ON Thursday the Convocation of Canterbury was further prorogued until the 10th of February, when it will meet for business.

THE *Daily News* says that for several years past the Bishop of Lincoln has not enjoyed good health, and that his recent serious illness, together with the death of his wife about a month ago, has so prostrated his lordship as to unfit him for his Episcopal duties. It is now said to be his intention to resign the bishopric, and in all probability the formal resignation will be made in the course of a few days. Dr. Wordsworth is much loved in his diocese, and his intended resignation will be heard of with the deepest regret.

THE whole of the Right Rev. Bench, with the exception of the Bishops of Oxford, Sodor and Man, and Worcester, have agreed that the same special subjects for examination be required from candidates for deacon's orders in the Old Testament, New Testament, Ecclesiastical History, and Latin; that the general subjects of the Bishop's examination be—(a) the contents of the Bible; (b) the Creeds and Thirty-nine Articles (history, text, and subject-matter); (c) the Prayer-book (history and contents); and that the subjects for each year's examination be agreed upon by a joint committee, consisting of the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Chester, and four members of the council of management of the preliminary examination. This committee has agreed to recommend the following special subjects for 1886:—1. Old Testament—(a) Psalms, Books III. and IV. (73-106); (b) 2 Kings with parallel passages in Chronicles. 2. New Testament (in Greek)—(a) the Gospel according to St. Mark; (b) the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistles of St. John. 3. Ecclesiastical History—(a) the History of the Christian Church to the Council of Constantinople (inclusive); (b) Outlinks of the History of the English

Church, with special reference to the history of the period, from 1509-1558. 4. Latin—(a) Augustine, "De Fide et Symbolo," and "De Symbolo ad Catechumenos;" (b) Leo, "Ad Flavianum Epistola."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Alington, Rev. Charles Argentine, B.A., Rector of Muckton; Rector of Swinhope.
 Barford, Rev. John Sheldon, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael, Wandsworth-common.
 Bott, Rev. R., Vicar of Hayton, Maryport.
 Brayshaw, Rev. W. H., Clerk in Holy Orders, Manchester Cathedral; Rectory of Holy Trinity, Hulme.
 Currie, Rev. Hugh Penton, Chaplain of Cuddesdon College; Principal of the Missionary College, Dorchester.
 Fisher, Rev. William Henry, Head Master of Dewsbury Grammar-school; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon.
 Gillart, Rev. James, B.A., Curate of Menai Bridge; Rector of Gentleshaw, Staffordshire.
 Godber, Rev. S., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Leicester.
 Guinness, Rev. R., Vicar of Market Harborough.
 Hatfield, Rev. T. H., Association Secretary of the Missions to Seamen.
 Haworth, Rev. R., Curate of St. Stephen's, Hulme; Curate-in-Charge of St. Matthias's Mission Church, in the Parish of All Saints', Chorlton-on-Medlock.
 Holme, Rev. R., M.A., Rector of Eastham (sinecure).
 Horsman, Rev. S. J. O'Hara, M.A., B.C.L., Rector of Condicote.
 Jones, Rev. C. A., M.A., Mathematical Master of Westminster School; Vicar of Dedham.
 Jones, Rev. Thomas W., Vicar of Garton-on-the-Wolds, York.
 Matthews, Rev. John Henry Dudley, M.A., Head Master of Leeds Grammar-school; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon.
 Meredith, Rev. Arthur E., M.A., Vicar of St. Wilfrid, Pool.
 Milner, Rev. C. P., M.A., Chaplain of Kelly College.
 Moberley, Rev. Walter Allan, M.A., Perpetual Curate of the Ascension, Blackheath.
 Passfield, Rev. Joseph, Curate of St. James's, Haywood; Vicar of All Souls', Liverpool.
 Robinson, Rev. Richard Hayes, Minister of St. Germain's Chapel, Kidbrooke.
 Rolfe, Rev. Harry Roger, Vicar of Misson, Notts.
 Wainwright, Rev. Samuel, D.D., Licensed to officiate in St. Paul's Iron Church, in the Parish of St. Mary, Balham.
 Wheeler, Rev. David, M.A., Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon.
 Woods, Rev. Edward S., Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Dover; Vicar of Ash, Sandwich.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Atthill, Rev. William, at his residence, Brandeston, Hall, Norfolk on the 11th inst., aged 77.
 Barry, Rev. William, late Rector of the Parish, at Blisworth Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 81.
 Dodson, Rev. Paul Augustus, M.A., Burgh-le-Marsh, Lincolnshire, on the 10th inst.
 Howie, Very Rev. James, Dean of Cloyne, at Barnbarow House, Cloyne, county Cork, on the 6th inst.
 Light, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Kensington-park, W., at 8, St. Boniface-road, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, on the 8th inst., aged 66.
 Postlethwaite, Rev. T. L., M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Busheyheath, and formerly Curate of St. Clement's, Barnsbury, at Kenley, Surrey, on the 11th inst., aged 33.
 Prior, Rev. W. P., British Chaplain, at Vevey, Switzerland, on the 11th inst.
 Sladen, Rev. Edward Henry Mainwaring, at the Gore, Bourne-mouth, on the 13th inst., aged 70.
 Werge, Rev. John Ingall, Rector of Somersal Herbert, Derbyshire, at Somersal, on the 9th inst., aged 72.
 Usill, Rev. James Harley, M.A., late Incumbent of All Saint's, Eastbourne, at Fulbourn, Lodge, Eastbourne, on the 15th inst., aged 55.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THIRST SATISFIED.

BY THE REV. W. J. KNOX-LITTLE, M.A., CANON
OF RIPON, AND RECTOR OF CHEETWOOD,
MANCHESTER.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. GEORGE'S, BOTOLPH
LANE, LONDON, ON SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 2ND,
1884.

"My soul is athirst for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before the presence of God?"—
PSALM xlii. 2.

THE verse, dear friends, which I have read to you for a text is one of those verses which justify in the highest degree the action of the Christian Church in selecting the Hebrew psalter as, in fact, her prayer-book. There are many passages, as you will feel with me, in the Hebrew psalter that express in a very high degree the wants of the human soul; but perhaps there is no passage more telling, more touching, more searching, more expressive than that solemn and that exalted sentiment which is spoken in the text, "My soul is athirst for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before the presence of God?" The passage is a justification, then, of the action of the Christian Church. People sometimes ask why in the daily service, why on Sundays, you rehearse the Psalms, which have about them so much that is incomprehensible, so much that requires explanation; why there are those tremendous denunciations of enemies, why there are those prayers that seem at first sight to touch wants that we modern people scarcely know; but if you want a real justification and a handy answer you may fall back upon the general texture of the psalter as expressed by such solemn words as those of the text. If you would find any document, any volume, that will speak your thoughts best about and towards eternity, you cannot select a better than the Hebrew psalter, for the general tone and temper of its teaching is the cry of the soul for God.

And then there is another thought upon the threshold of such a subject that demands our attention. This verse of the text, being a sort of example or representative verse of the psalter, expresses to us—does it not?—the attitude and the mission of the Christian Church. The attitude. For what is the position, dear friends, of the Christian Church. What are the struggles of Christian souls except, in the midst of a world that is quite complicated with difficulties, in the

midst of a world that is overwhelmed with sorrow, in the midst of a time of severe temptation, to constantly rise and gaze high above the thought of evil, and gaze towards the sun of brightness, and cry for God? And what is the mission of the Christian Church? Is it not to help men and women in their struggle and their sorrow to forget at least at times their pettinesses and degradation to rise to better standards and loftier ideals, and cry for God? And if that be the mission of the Christian Church, then I hold—and that is my point this morning—that that is the justification of such noble efforts as have been made in your church, to enable so great, so sinful a city as London to have at least moments of relaxation from its world-wide weariness, moments of pause in the pursuit of its sin, and moments to call it back from that which is overpowering though transient—to ask it to pass them in the ministrations of religion. What is the object of such a church as this? Why, buried among your buildings, in the midst of this great, powerful, sinful city,—why has it a mission for eternity? Why is it good—that you should do your best? Why is it praise-worthy and beautiful that your rector and churchwardens should have exerted themselves to the utmost to make this church what it ought to be? Why? Because there is not a man or woman in London, not one in this bustling crowd, not one in this confusion of commerce, not one in this sink of sin, but might say, "Yes"—ought to say, and must ultimately feel, and should now be taught to realise that the soul has one satisfaction, one only—"my soul is athirst for God, for the living God." Well, if that be so, can we be wrong, dear friends, can we waste our time, if we ask ourselves this morning something quite practical about this thirst of the soul?

And, first of all, I submit that in such a verse as this, and in such a work as this, we are face to face with one of those great governed contrasts that are found throughout Scripture and throughout human life. I may say, *par parenthèse*, that that is one of the great proofs of sacred Scripture. When your shallow thinker, when your wild and profound philosopher, kicks the sacred Book with the toe of his boot, and denounces it because he does not like the measure of Noah's Ark or the exact activity of Jonah's whale, the moment you begin to think beneath those mere sharpnesses of speech and those mere quicknesses of the thought, you say this: "There may be this or that about the surface of Scripture which I do not and cannot explain, and cannot entirely understand; but at least there is no book—no, not excepting Milton; no, not even excepting Dante; no, not for us English people, making any reserve for Shakespeare—there is no book that, after all, expresses that deep, inner, serious fact of my being, of my soul, of myself; the fact that lives when outer facts are dying; the fact that persists in asserting itself

when the noise of the world is still ; the fact that does not care about daylight only, but comes up in the dark ; the fact that whispers low when I am in the crowd, but speaks loud in the darkest night when the clock is ticking on the stairs, and conscience has stalked out and stood before me, asserting facts that I cannot contradict — there is no book that can speak that fact of facts, that thirst, that longing, that desolation, that desire, that hope, that activity, that possibility of supreme contention and final victory, there is nothing like the Bible that does that." And so wise men, while they admit difficulties, thoughtful men, while they do not controvert the fact that that which is Divine needs larger explanation, fall back — I speak *par parenthèse*, merely in passing, for it is worth remembering—fall back upon such great governed truths as that text to support the Bible. The Bible says, asserts, determines, and insists upon the truth which the Church is insisting upon, which you and I, in our better moments, emphasise and say "Amen" to, the soul is athirst for God. The Bible brings home the great contrast that is present to us all.

Let us dwell, that we may realise this thirst of the soul, upon the contrast. There are, at least, four forms of attraction which are presented, as I suppose, to your soul, certainly to mine. First of all, there is the attraction of natural beauty. If you stand, on a fair August afternoon, on the terrace, for instance, at Berne, or on the heights of Chaumont ; if you gaze at the distant Alps crowned with snow which was generated in winter, but which takes the brightness and glory of diamonds in the summer sun ; if coming from the noise and heat of England you first gaze at that line of strange pointed mountains crowned with that whiteness, struck with the sunlight, you are moved by natural beauty. If you stand in America on the upper reaches of the St. Lawrence, and watch the river as it hurries to its destiny at Niagara ; if you see the tossing water writhing almost like living creatures anticipating a dreadful destiny and an awful death ; if you watch it as it foams and swells, and cries like an agonised spirit, and then see it giving way to destiny and passing over the Fall ; or if, rising out of what is tragic in nature, you come to what is homely—if, for instance, you see the chestnut woods of spring with an inspiration of quiet joy, or if you see the elms at Worcester or Hereford in our common England in the autumn time with an inspiration of sorrow ; wherever you turn with eye or head, with a feeling in your heart, a thought in your mind, nature demands her recognition ; and you London men, in the toil of your struggle, in the noise of your work, in the dust of your confusion of life, when you get your holiday in spring or autumn—unless, indeed, you have passed into the mere condition of a brute—while you still keep the heart of a man, you feel there is something in the apostles of culture, in

the teachers of æsthetics, in persons who say that beauty is everything to satisfy the soul. Nature, you say, and you say it justly, says, "Beauty." You find a delight as you gaze upon Nature. Yes, dear friends ; you are stimulated, you are delighted, you are consoled ; there is one thing which you are not—you are not satisfied. Or, quite possibly, you turn to that which seems to English natures more practical and less poetical—you turn to the attraction of activity. You say the poets, or the preachers, or the dreamers may gaze upon nature ; but Englishmen have something else to do—we have to work. You look at the result of activity, and it is splendid. Imagine, picture for a moment, political achievement ; picture to yourself the power not only of a mind, but of a personality, of a character which can attract vast millions who have never gazed upon the human expression in the human face—can attract them to great love or to great hatred, can mould the destinies of an Empire, can change the current of the time—think of such men as Richelieu or Cavour, or more modern instances, and you understand what is the greatness and the power of the attraction of political activity. Or, to come nearer home, go into your London city, and watch the working of your London mart. What have you before you there? The activity of the hearts and minds of Englishmen, sending out the force of the life that is in them from the heart that is beating in those tremendous centres to the distances that are only stopped by the most distant frontiers of the world. Your sayings and thoughts are quoted throughout the markets of Europe—yes, throughout the markets of other continents ; your actions and decisions make the difference between the decisions and the actions of men that you have never seen, that you never shall see. The Medici were a power in Florence, first as bankers, then as governors. There are men in London who have power throughout the world, not only in Florence, not as professed governors, but as practical governors through the activity of commercial instinct. Certainly, it seems to me quite possible that there may be minds carried away by such a great activity ; but that great activity I submit to your deeper, quieter English Sunday thought — that activity will stimulate, will delight, will attract, will intoxicate ; one thing it will not do—I am bold to say it will never satisfy.

And if I may take another instance for a moment, there is this pure intellect, bidding good-bye to the political arena, to the commercial strife, saying farewell to the dreams of beauty, and falling back upon the cells of the brain, traversing the corridors of thought and entering first here and there into that labyrinth of instinct or association or accumulative learning. Certainly, there is a power of a delight that the world can never realise outside the region of the brain. If that needs proof you have only, dear friends, to meditate

upon such lives as Newton, or Shakespeare, or Kepler; or if you turn to the region of meditative thought, to such lives as our own George Eliot—yes, there is that in the mere exercise of intellect which is, intoxicating, which is consoling even to the highest degree. But intellect, after all, finds its frontier. I may say of it what I have said of the æsthetic sentiment, what I have said of the active sentiment in man, it attracts, it delights—what is more, I think it even consoles; but the one thing I find about it that to me is perfectly appalling is that it does not satisfy. There are many of you, perhaps, to-day who will demand that I should take my fourth instance, and will ask that that at least may do its duty. Will it? There is the region of the affections—that region wherein we stray in early spring days as pickers of the spring flowers of our opening life, where suns are always glorious and sunsets only speak of brighter dawn, where poetry is in all ordinary conversation and hope springs to higher heights from hour to hour, where Mays are always Mays and Junes are always June, where flowers are ever bursting and there seems no end to our nosegays, no limit to our imaginations, no fetter to our fancies, no restraint to our desires. There is the world, the vast, powerful world, of the passions, purified by exhaustive cultivation into what we call the affections of a higher life. By them we deal with our fellow-creatures; by them, when we are young, we form great friendships; by them, as we grow older, we form around us certain associations that we intend to support us as life goes off. We have all known it. There is the friend, there is the sweetheart, there is the wife, there is the child, there are the dear expressions of that strong heart that after all beats in Englishmen. But as life goes on, first in one object and then by anticipation and terror perhaps in others, we watch those who have been dear to us, and we fear for others who are dear—we watch them pass in dim procession to the grave, and we find, after all, that in the world of affections that old strange strange law that pervades one branch of the contrast prevails: it can stimulate, it can support, it can console, it can delight, it can lead to delirium at moments, but it does not satisfy. And, my brothers and sisters, because you and I are born not for a moment, but for infinite moments; not for the struggle of time, but for the great platform and career of eternity—because that is so, never, never, if we are true to ourselves, shall we pause in the midst of our mortal pilgrimage until we find and grasp and embrace and love that which satisfies. When you waken up a young heart to that truth, then that heart, as I hold it, is on the path of conversion. When amidst the struggle of sin you have determined the soul to strive after that truth, then that soul is in process of solid conversion and final perfectability. But, at any rate, all human nature joins that cry of the

Christian, and the Bible speaks of it as it always does—its ultimate truth expressing what we need. No; there are many things given, there are many attractions to draw; they will stimulate, they will help, they will console, they will give pleasure; there is one thing that satisfies the immortal, there is one life that meets your need: “My soul is athirst for God, for the living God; when shall I come to appear before the presence of God?” Why, dear friends, why is it that these things do not satisfy? There lies a city in the Volscian Hills, fair and beautiful, climbing in its peaks and pinnacles up little ledges of the rocks, and down into the depths of the valleys. And if you wander some two days from Rome, and gaze upon those mountains, historic in their memories and splendid in their beauty, you are struck by the tenderness and the attraction of that city. It is a city of flowers. The flowers stream up its streets in grave procession; they climb up the pillars of churches, embracing them and holding on with arms of deep affection; they laugh in the sunshine, they weep in the shadow, they are shrouded in the clouds of night, but they blaze again in the blaze of the morning. There is the dim funereal ivy, there is the brightness and glow of the purple convolvulus, there is the wild rose clustering round the windows. They are lying asleep on the doorsteps, they gather themselves into knots as if to gossip and to talk about the language of flowers by the doorways—utterly beautiful! You look at the city with wonder and astonishment—with desire. How wonderful, you say, that church tower covered with its flowers; that altar covered not with flowers, gathered and placed in vases, but with nature’s own hand arranging an offering to the living God. These streets that sound no footfall of an angry multitude, but that listen to the footfall of a quiet nature—yes, it is beautiful in the early morning. But stay there until the later afternoon, when the fog begins to gather; stay there until night-time when the miasma begins to rise; stay there until morning, and you are in danger of destruction from poison. It is a land of flowery expression; but it is not a land of real life.

My friends, the activity of man, the poetic faculty of man, all the gifts and all the capacities of man—they are beautiful, they are touching, they are attractive; but if they are all, if they express all that you have to offer, and all that is in you to feel, then they are hollow, or they are poisonous and like that city of flowers. Why? Because there is in you and me a soul that lies behind our thought, although it is more than thought that is underneath our feeling; although there is more than feeling there—a soul that supports our will, and is more than our volition. It thinks, but is not thought; it feels, but is not feeling; it wills, but is not volition. There is something deeper in man than his æsthetic desire or his active practice, something deeper beneath us all

than anything that finds expression, certainly than anything that finds satisfaction. There is the self; there is myself, yourself; there is that strange, mysterious life of loneliness which understands, and thinks, and judges, and appraises. When, by Divine grace, we escape from the voice of the crowd, and from the cry of custom, from the delirium of desire, that poor lonely self within us pleads to us with a cry like the call of the starveling crying to the rich man that passes by, "Oh, will you gratify desire? Oh, will you gratify pleasure? Oh, will you stimulate activity, and will you leave me alone? I, yourself, your very self, the foundation of your life, the permanent expression of your immortality—I must be satisfied, and being infinite and immortal I know but one satisfaction: 'My soul is athirst for God, for the living God. When shall I come and appear before the presence of God?'"

If that be true, or if it be approximately true, dear friends, let us ask ourselves this morning these questions. Let us be quite practical. What do you mean, you may say for a moment, by the thirst for God? I remember long ago in Paris, in conversation with one whom I deem one of the greatest modern statesmen, though not one of the most successful—I remember, when a mere boy, talking to that thoughtful man just at the moment when he was standing amidst the ruins of his activity, and gazing with that placid spirit with which a good man gazes when he feels that he has done his duty, though the world can see that he has failed—I remember talking to him on such questions as these, and what he said, among other things, was this: "In dealing with mankind and in dealing with yourself you must rise by degrees, you must advance from point to point; there is a point of achievement, but you cannot reach the point of achievement unless you have gone up the ladder of progress." I follow his advice. What do we mean by thirsting for God? My friends on the lower round of that ladder, I mean thirsting for and desiring moral truth. I mean that the soul within you is thirsting and imploring for the satisfaction of its moral instincts. Turn for an instant to the Ten Commandments; they are trite, they are ordinary, they are placed before you in the east end of your church after the old custom of your practical, unæsthetic, and undreaming England. Ask what they mean? Turn to the second table. You are to reverence your father and mother. Why? Because they are the instruments of life that God gives. You are to reverence life in others in the Sixth Commandment. Why? Because life is the deepest mystery that God can possibly exhibit to you. In the Seventh Commandment—I scarcely like to say, but yet it is wise to repeat, it is necessary to assert it—we are to remember, you and I, when we are young, when we are active, when we are passionate, the great responsibility of man; you are not to trifle

with that awful mystery, the transmission of life, life which unites itself with eternal love. You are to remember respect for property, for that which Divine Providence has placed by wise laws in the hands of others. You are to remember that the best of properties is a good character. Finally, in the Tenth Commandment, you are not to forget that Divine Providence guides you, and you are not to murmur and be angry when He guides you who knows the best for you, and when you have done your best. And rising from the second table and coming to the first, you are not to forget that there is one object for every soul, as the text asserts. You are not to forget that a jealousy may be created, ought to be created, if you put anything before God. You are not to grudge God the restraint of speech, and—thank God, still it is possible to appeal to the wise instincts of England—you are not to grudge on your Sunday the gift of your time. These are the outlines of the grave moral law that runs deep into the heart of the Christian; and I answer the thirst for God means the thirst within me to fulfil that grave moral law.

But, my friends, pause for a moment. After all, that would only be a skeleton. After all, simply to draw the outlines of a picture is not the work of an artist. Suppose you ask a master in music, "How am I to produce the real result of stately sound?" He will tell you about the common chord; he will tell you about the results of its changes and its affinities, and will speak of those results as harmony; or he will tell you about the gamut of sounds—sounds found in the wind upon the mountains, found in the surging sea, found in the voice of childhood, found in the whisper of your dreams—sound that is everywhere, sound that wanders up and down this wild, wild universe. He will tell you all that, and explain how in proper steps, in wise modulation, is melody, as the union of sounds is harmony. Is that enough? Would that produce "The Last Judgment" of Spohr, that made you dissolve in tears? Would that produce the chorus of Handel that made you almost rise and march in majesty? Would that fill you with deep thoughts in Beethoven, or fire you into joy in Mendelssohn? Oh, no! You have your skeleton, but you have not one thing, the deepest; genius has to touch with its fire the fact that is before you; you want the mystery of life. And then suppose you turn to an artist and ask him to guide you in painting, and he talks to you about light and shadow, about the laying on of colour, about the drawing of lines, about the exact expression of the distant and the present, of the foreground and the background, and having learned it all you produce what seems an abortion; you ask yourself, "What is the meaning of this?" Is this enough to make you quiver, in Dresden, before the San Sisto, carried away by those Divine eyes of the Mother of Eternity, or rent with sorrow before the solemn

eyes of the Child? Is this enough to fill you with tears of delight when you enter the Sistine Chapel, and see St. John as he kneels with his unshed tears about the dead Christ? What is there wanting in the touch of your artist? There is wanting genius; there is wanting life. Or, to take one instance more. You ask somebody to teach you sculpture, to tell you how to make yourself master in the treatment of stone. He will tell you wise things about the plastic material that you have to mould with thumb and finger, and then about the use of the chisel and the hammer to produce the result in the stone, following the treatment of that plastic material. But when you have learned it all, can you really believe that you will produce the effect of that majestic manhood that you see in the David of Angelo in the Piazza of Florence, or that wise, determined progress that is expressed in Donatello's St. George? What is the difference between your failure and the results of those men? Genius—life. And when you turn to the moral law, and when you ask yourself, "How can I learn to be athirst for God," the preachers say, "Accept the moral law; act exactly in distinct duty to your parents; say, 'Corban, it is a gift by whatsoever thou mayest be profited thereby;' do your duty strictly to the letter and nothing more; be conservative about your property; restrain yourself from desire of change; do not stimulate and do not satisfy your passions beyond what is exactly expressed in the moral law." But then, if you speak the truth, you say, "And in the end, what am I? Why, after all, most commonplace, and, in truth, most sinful." What is the difference? This difference: there wants not here the touch of genius; there wants the touch of life Divine, grace that illuminates the moral law; there wants, my friends, the enthusiasm for goodness, the science of sciences, the art of arts, the delight and the desire of doing right because it is right, the great and splendid spirit that belongs to all of us; and yet it is the highest when the thirst of your soul is real. Certainly it is to know God's guidance in law; but what is law? It is to grasp that atmosphere of life and reality which comes out of the moral law to those who seek it in a living person first—the desire of goodness, the desire, the love, the enthusiasm, the ambition, cost what it may, of doing right because it is right. Oh, my friends, I submit, and I submit it without fear of contradiction, that is an ambition worthy of Englishmen. Certainly we are not dreamers; certainly God has given us practical activity; certainly, whatever we misunderstand, this we can understand, the thirst of the soul for God is the thirst to love goodness because it is right.

And then hastily to conclude, lest I should strain your patience—although, perhaps, I may need no apology, having one opportunity here and no more—I would say that that thirst is expressed,

that that thirst is satisfied, not only in moral law and in its atmosphere, but in one thing more that I think we can all understand. When we read the New Testament, so simple, so straightforward, so true, so beautiful, with some difficulties, but no difficulties that a true art can find insuperable—when we read the New Testament we are brought face to face with the teachings of Christ. And there is this, my friends, more about these teachings, that if you are to follow them out you have not time enough in time: the teachings of our Master demand eternity—there is something about them infinite, so simple, so beautiful, and yet we feel that we are insufficient to fulfil them in this sphere of time. If my soul is athirst for God, it is athirst for the fulfilment of those great, splendid, practical teachings which remind me that I am to begin to learn my lesson in this narrow school, but that I shall fulfil my achievement in that great land beyond the grave. Is that enough? No; no, when the heart is lonely; no, when the sun is setting; no, when the clouds are gathering round us; no, when the storm is coming up. It is useless for the preacher, if he tries to be real, to talk about law, or the result of law, or the splendour of teaching; if we know the human heart in its width and its activity, if it is to find satisfaction it must find it in a personal life. You may say you cannot know God. That is the ordinary answer of the human, sinning heart, which in modern times calls itself agnostic. Know God! Well, of course, it is truly said that it is by mere licence of speech when you talk of knowledge about human perceptions—it is wisely said. You perceive a fact, my friend; you must perceive it in itself, and as it is, and by an intellect that can infallibly state that it is so and in that manner. Knowledge like that is impossible, I grant; but between that scientific knowledge and utter unbelief there are shades, first of all of assent that shuts out doubt, and at last, at the other pole, of a doubt that almost shuts out assent. Between the two there are activities of life, and if you are to say, "I cannot know the personal God with scientific knowledge, I grant it;" but you cannot know anything, not only in theology, but in politics or social life, or moral conduct, or conduct that is not moral—you can know nothing, you can never act at all, because all our action is not on knowledge, but on belief, and therefore when we turn to a personal life that is not perceived by the activity of the senses we only demand that you are to accept that which it is possible to accept in any sphere of activity, and which you do accept. It is possible for you according to the laws of your being to accept a personal Christ. "But," you say—and I must remind you of it as I close—"a personal Christ, but still not clothed in human lineaments, a personal Christ who is mysterious—how can you accept that?" How can you not? My friends, the human intellect is so framed that

it acts habitually upon ideas that are true yet indistinct. You act on space, you act on time, you have infinity, you have in your mouth the word "cause." What do you know exactly about infinity, or space, or time, or cause? The human intellect, it is truly said, first by the greatest of the Fathers, then repeated by modern thinkers—the human intellect is so great, first that it can take exact ideas, and then, because it is infinite, that it can act instantly upon ideas that are real ideas, but indistinct. Christ—yes, first He is indistinct, yet most real—real because He entered into history, real because He expressed the idea that is in the brain and heart of us all: indistinct because these little twenty centuries have separated us from His actual historic life; but a fact to those who seek Him, because His power is to make Himself an inward gift to the human soul, because His activity is such that He meets us on the altar of His sacred sacrament, that He meets us in the Divine word to express His thoughts, that He meets us in consolation, that He meets us in absolution, in moments of sorrow and of prayer. Oh, you are not driven to a distant infinity! Oh, you are not asked to rest upon a shadow! Oh, you are not besought to play the dreamer, or the sentimentalist, when you think about God! Oh, you are asked to remember that fair, sweet vision—the vision of a Man so devoid of vulgarity, that whilst He loved the people He did not despise the great—the vision of a Man so strong that He could face a multitude, so tender that He could raise the lost woman, so gentle that the little children gathered their arms about His neck; the vision of a Man at home with fishermen, and at home with the high born, with thoughts so deep that they permeate modern Christendom, with thoughts so simple that they taught truth to ancient Galilee; the vision of a Man who encouraged youth, the One on whom we rest, by whom we hang, in whom we hope, who sympathises with all our best desires, who does not denounce us, but only intercedes and pities; the Man who never places Himself upon a Pharisaic pedestal, but feels with the child, with the boy, with the man, with the woman,—the Man of men, the crown of our humanity, the God in Man, the Man in God, the power of the sacraments, the force of prayer, the sweet, dear Friend who never misunderstands us, never forsakes us, never is hard upon us. My friends, it is your privilege, it is mine, beyond the privilege of the Psalmist, to know in the Gospel, to know in the Church, Christ, God expressed in humanity. Is your soul athirst for the Highest? You may find it if you come in repentance, if you come in desire, if you come in quiet determination to do your duty, you may find it satisfied—yes, now satisfied—in Christ.

And that, I take it, is the object of your church—to help this dear, great work in London during the hours of toil, and excitement, and sorrow; to help

these brave, strong men, our brothers, in the midst of their toil and dust of life, to throw themselves into such sacred shadows and to remember the sunlight of eternity, to find their satisfaction in Christ. Therefore I congratulate you upon the reopening of your church. Therefore I remind you that to do that is to furnish men with a power, a spiritual power, which will enable them to appreciate the evidences of Christianity; to furnish men with a spiritual hope that will enable them to stand against the difficulties of life; to furnish men with spiritual power that will be by them—I speak that I know, not in theory, but from experience—which will be by them in those last solemn and dreadful moments when the intoxication of the senses and the voice of the crowd, and the delirium of desire, and the power of passion are attenuated into the consistence of a dream, and when alone they are standing face to face with the Eternal—a power that will help them at such moments to be strong and brave men—the power of God's presence. Do you thirst for God? Are you putting something between your thirst and God's satisfaction? My brothers and sisters, give up your sin; put it down. You cannot in a moment; it will need struggle, and determination, and strength of purpose, with sad moments and trial; but there is Christ, there is Christ and God; and if you fight it like brave men, if you live the life of the Church to-day—I cannot forget it—if you live the life of the saints—for that was the secret of their sanctity—then indeed for you and me, I most sincerely believe it, we shall be amongst those who come to Zion, with songs upon our heads, to that bright moment when thirst is satisfied, when sorrow is ended, when doubt is concluded, when sorrow and sighing shall flee away. Live for that moment, and you may satisfy your thirst with God, with God in Christ.

THE Rector of Beaumaris being desirous of removing the choir from the gallery to the chancel, the organist and singers have resigned.

THE National Society has received donations of a hundred guineas from the Mercers' Company and ten guineas from the Skinners' Company.

NEW MEDALS FOR HEROES.—A movement is being set on foot in connection with *The Quiver* to raise a fund for the permanent provision of a number of Medals of Honour, to be awarded for special heroism in the rescue of human life. Particulars of such cases, properly authenticated, are invited by the Editor.

A NEW GAME OF CRICKET.—Under the title of "Indoor Cricket, and how to play it," the January Part of *Little Folks Magazine* contains a paper giving full instructions how to play a novel and exciting form of this ever-popular game. As the name indicates, this pastime is a modification of the game, whereby Cricket may be played within doors, and matches between teams of the highest excellence may be contested as keenly in the parlour as on the usual cricket-grounds.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscription (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d. twelve months, 10s. 10d. are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XVII. are now ready.



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1884.

SOCIAL CHASMS.

IN a recent article on "Socialism" we took the opportunity of alluding to Mr. Henry George's book, "Progress and Poverty," and showed the utter fallacy of several of its arguments; yet while the plans proposed by the Socialists will not hold good, and can never be made to work, without a complete revolution and the overthrow of all scientific principles and landmarks, as well as of time-honoured customs and usages, which Englishmen cling to, still we think that there are reasons why some favour the revolutionary schemes which are propounded, and these are the social chasms which separate class from class. They exist in society and even find their way into works undertaken for promoting the spread of Christ's Gospel, Church Decorations, Guild Meetings, Teas, and Entertainments. They may not be so palpable in some parts of the country as in others, but if we will only look about us, we shall discern them. There is nothing so injurious, nothing which causes so much real hindrance to any work for God, as when this class feeling or jealousy creeps in. And it may be that those outside of some given circle see and note these feelings, and possibly rush into the opposite extreme, desiring to see all differences and distinctions disappear, and all placed on an apparent equality, forgetting all the while that in Nature real equality does not and cannot ever exist, and that in some way or other the "elder must serve the younger." But when we assert that these social chasms exist and may possibly tend to preclude the exercise of neighbourly charity, we must not be supposed to imply that therefore all distinctions are henceforth to disappear, because there always will be differences

in rank and position, as in bodily and mental faculties; but take the case of a man whose lot has been cast, say in some manufacturing town, he is placed in business, and in course of time becomes, either by himself, or in partnership with some one else, an employer of labour; he brings up his family with the greatest care, sends, it may be, his sons to the public schools, and gives to his daughters the best possible education; but when all this has been done, they may possibly be precluded from mixing in any society beyond those of other business families, or if invited to do so some perhaps will treat then coldly, and say to others in sneering tones—"They have been in trade," or that the father is only a merchant or manufacturer as the case may be; hence isolation—a social barrier is set up, and a chasm separates them from others, and as a natural consequence there crop up cliques and parties. If engaged in any work for God, where all ought to be union and harmony, some will not join if others are at work. Yet where would England have been if it had not been for her merchant princes? Where would have been the churches, the schools, and other kindred works for the amelioration of suffering humanity, if it had not been for the benevolence of such as these, who having freely received freely give? The same may be predicated of all other honest trades and professions, each hath need of the other. It may be stated that we are quoting isolated and exceptional cases, but we know that in many places this supercilious exclusiveness does exist, and may be recognised by anyone who will look behind the scenes. One small town of our acquaintance was actually divided into two separate parties, which would have nothing to do with one another, and if anyone should attempt to break down the barrier he would be "cut," while in another place a meeting (informal, of course) was held, where it was debated whether certain people should be admitted into so-called society. It is true that Christian society ought not to consist of one class more than another, and if people know how to behave themselves, these artificial barriers have an injurious tendency and foster the spirit of exclusiveness and uncharitableness. If they are allowed to obtrude themselves in works of charity, Sunday-school teaching, district visiting, and numerous other works which should exist in every well-organised parish, they will be very damaging and give the enemy cause to blaspheme, and question whether our boasted Christianity has the power which it is asserted to have. The clergy can do a great deal to break down absurd and unnecessary social barriers; we do not mean the denouncing of them from the pulpit, but they, who should know no difference between the rich and the poor and who have an entrance into all houses in the parish, from the lowest cottage to the parlour of the shopkeeper and tradesman, and the mansion

of the rich, by tact and gentleness, by a few words wisely spoken here and there, by a refusal to be party to any irrational cliqueism, by bringing all together like the members of the human body to work for God and His Church, may do a great deal for human health and progress here and hereafter. Two revered statesmen recently lost to us, Joseph Warner Henley and Henry Fawcett, who were close observers of nature, and remarkable for their shrewd common sense, did much to check the revolutionary spirit and wild dreams and fancies of Socialists; and we believe that Churchmen, who will follow in their steps, may do much to convert the so-called Christian Socialists, who, like Dean Oakley in the PULPIT of the 5th inst., take the Communism of the first Church at Jerusalem as an example to be followed and not as a warning to be avoided. Canon Rawstorne's truthful sermon on "Labour and Flattery," which we published on October 25, is a specimen of the teaching and work that we desire to see more extensively undertaken by the clergy. It may not be accomplished all at once, but little by little the object will be attained, and we shall see that which we pray for—"the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

HOW TO DEAL WITH "ROOKERIES."

SIR,—One of the letters which lately appeared in the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT on overcrowding states that rents of a certain class in London have advanced within a few years from eight shillings a week to fourteen. The writer of the letter does not say that he thinks such a condition of things calls for interference on the part of the State or the Legislature; but his mode of handling the subject, which mode is a very common one, makes one suppose that he does think that a case for such interference exists. I am not of that opinion: I am of opinion that the rents of houses and land are affairs with which the State has properly no more to do than with the price of candles and sugar. I say this because when social subjects have to be discussed, sound and correct conclusions as to public action (and private action also) cannot reasonably be hoped to be arrived at unless correct views are first held as to the rights and duties of the public in the premises. It is no part of the duty of society to see that its members have proper houses to live in; it is the duty of a man to look after that, like all such matters, for himself. It is the duty of society towards itself, to see that no nuisances or disease-manufactories shall be permitted within its boundaries; and it is within the rights of society to enact such laws and such mode of procedure under them both as shall suppress nuisances when they have arisen, and also as shall prevent their creation.

Rookeries are a nuisance of the disease-manufacturing kind; and rookeries should be put down. I need not here define what I mean; if I were drafting an Act of Parliament respecting them I should then

require to define them. I suppose all reasonable men are agreed that it is desirable and would be for the public advantage that they should be suppressed, differing only as to the practicability of suppression, and as to the mode. Respecting the practicability, many people take for granted, or seem to do so, that if the dwellings of half-a-million of Londoners are declared by law unfit for human habitation, as being nuisances, and as wanting in those things without which houses cannot but be such, it becomes the business of the law or of the society in its legal capacity to provide houses for those who are unhoused. This is an utter mistake; there is no such duty on the part of the community; there is on the contrary a duty on its part to abstain from any such action; this kind of thing ought to be always, and must be eventually, supposing that it is not so from the beginning, left to the ordinary course of trade. I shall not attempt to prove this; that it is so is an incontrovertible fact of economical experience. If the suppression of these nests of disease is resolved on, let it be carried out, and let the trade difficulties produced by their extermination set themselves right as all trade difficulties do. The mode is the real question, and there is the subsidiary question concerning the compensation to be awarded to the owners of the buildings which were originally, or have become by neglect, unfit dwellings for human beings. As for the latter, it is not hard to settle; the owner of a nuisance is entitled to no premium or *solatium* for being compelled to abate it. If his den has a trade value irrespective of its hitherto value as a rent-producing rookery, as a store or warehouse, or if he could get a rent for it for an innocuous business or manufacture; and if it has to be taken from him for public uses, wider streets for instance, let him be paid for it according to its trade value. But if he is simply made to cease to employ it as a lodging-house, he should get nothing. This is a matter of great practical importance, and I am convinced that I am enouncing the correct principle. The legal proceeding ought to be on the following basis: Every person who has an interest in the public health and cleanliness has a natural right to initiate proceedings in their defence, and the community as such has a duty to maintain its surroundings in a clean and healthy state. Under our present municipal organisation, which is very defective, the community can often act only through a vestry, but there are not wanting public-spirited individuals who would gladly combine as voluntary committees, were there a proper tribunal before which they could go with their proofs, and present rookeries as nuisances detrimental to the general health. I am of opinion, but in this I speak with reserve, that the County Court, with power to the judge to employ a jury to assist him, would be a proper tribunal for the purpose contemplated.

I do not wish to make this letter too long, else I should have much to say concerning the serious obstacles presented towards all civic improvements by the cumbrous, not to say, useless and mischievous legal forms which surround all our dealings with real property. A Church journal is perhaps not the most appropriate to discuss this subject in. But a Church journal is a proper one in which to bring before the public the general subject of the moral and religious duties of the public, in this as in other matters that affect morals, and that not very indirectly.

I observe that some of your correspondents com-

plain of political economy. They are only a little less unreasonable than those of Newton's contemporaries who objected to the law of gravitation. No social improvements can be effected except through the due recognition of scientific law, whether that law be physiological, or moral, as jurisprudence and economics are.

P.S.—Since writing above I have read Mrs. Stuart's letter in to-day's CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. Your correspondent repeats the guess of Malthus about increase of population going on more rapidly than means of subsisting it, as if it were an ascertained and admitted fact. Unfortunately it is admitted by numbers of people, but it is not ascertained, there being no evidence whatever to prove it, and all antecedent reasons being against it. The possibility of such a doctrine obtaining acceptance is a signal instance of the absence of thinking, or of the exercise of thought, among people in general. The doctrine rests on a purblind regard to one aspect of one condition of society, the development of which was hindered by artificial laws, which the theorist (or guesser) thought were essential and untraversable.

13th December, 1884.

B.

SIR,—I am pleased to see you do not fall in with the views of those who would contravene the divine law. Millions of acres await populations to develop their food-producing powers. Rather than favour possible or impossible devices for checking the fruitfulness of the race, I would suggest some plan for the alienation of part of the 136 millions spent on alcoholic beverages from their present channels, and the diversion of them to emigration purposes on a scale commensurate with the national need.

Ten millions a year would hardly be missed from the drink bill, but would go far soon to replenish the waste places of the earth, instead of leaving them a wilderness, and to relieve our overcrowded cities.

The idea I suggest can hardly be said to be Utopian. It only requires willing hearts and hands and prudent heads to set about the work.

At least, more may be done to promote successful emigration than has ever yet been done or attempted.

M.

IS EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP IDOLATROUS?

SIR,—I am obliged for your kindness in printing my letter, it is an instance of "fair play" on your part. Of course I did not mean to invoke the *argumentum ad baculum* in the *literal* sense. I have no desire to occupy much of your space, but surely you must feel it is a serious charge to maintain, "that certain practices now generally connived at by the bishops are idolatrous." It is a long time ago since in my college days, I read Locke's essay; but, so well as I remember, he mentioned the *argumentum ad verecundiam*, and in the case before us I recommend it to your notice. Surely it is highly improbable that a body of men like the English bishops *should generally connive at idolatrous practices*. You must excuse me, but it seems to me much more probable that the practices in question are not what you represent them to be than that they are. If your view be correct the condition of the Church is melancholy indeed. "The bishops generally connive at idolatrous practices." Do they connive consciously or

unconsciously? If unconsciously they are thereby convicted of culpable ignorance; if consciously, of something worse—of a degree of moral guilt which it is alarming to contemplate in a body of religious teachers. I fear, sir, you have not *weighed* your words in bringing such a charge against them. Generally you write in a calm and philosophic spirit, but here your utterances remind one of the rantings and ravings of the *Rock*. Look at some of them again—"Fetish worship," "Idolatrous Ritual," "Prominent superstitions," "Churches to be devoted to gross idolatry." Why, sir, like *Hamlet*, you may say I

Must —— unpack my heart with words
And fall a cursing like a very drab
A scullion!
Fye upon't! Foh!

If the question were not so serious I might congratulate you, in Yankee phraseology, on your success in piling up the agony; but I leave it to others to do so.

I hope if there are any Ritualists among your readers *they* will take up the discussion of the question of Eucharistic worship. It is *not*, as you describe it, "the worship of a wafer or morsel of bread supposed to contain the Deity." I am not concerned to defend it, as I don't practise it myself; but why not ask Canon Liddon, whose splendid sermons occasionally enrich your pages, to explain and defend what you, in your wisdom and charity, are pleased to call the "idolatry" and "fetish worship" of his school. It seems to me very like a *reductio ad absurdum* to describe the ablest modern advocate of the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as at once a great Christian Apologist and an idolater. But I may suffer from "a plentiful lack of wit"! Let me express a hope, sir, that your fit of temporary insanity will soon pass off; that you will cease to "speak evil of dignities"; that you will resume your wanted philosophic calm and breadth, and be true to what I verily believe is your guiding principle—

You cannot speak of reason to the Dane
And lose your voice.

FAIR PLAY.

[We are pleased to accept our correspondent's practice as a much weightier argument for, than his precepts against, our contention.—ED.]

SIR,—As a reader of your paper from the first number, allow me to tell you that I am greatly gratified indeed with your recent articles on matters ecclesiastical. Far better is it that the Press and the Pulpit should fearlessly speak the truth in love, as you do, than to speak smooth things and prophesy deceit in presence of danger. I fully hold with you, Sir, that "the worship of a wafer biscuit, or morsel of bread is an idolatry—a fetish worship." And I would add, such worship of the Sacrament is far worse, in my opinion, than the fetishism of the tribes of Africa, as well as far less excusable, because it poisons the "wells of salvation," and abuses the holiest things—masterpiece of Satan's many devices—to the ruin of souls. And they are not "higher views" of the Sacrament as "Fair Play" thinks, but lower and degrading views, which involve those who hold them in worse than heathen idolatry. May I hope, sir, that in your love of fair play you will not allow serious readers to be offended with miserable dogrel, and a style incompatible with the solemn subject under consideration, if not altogether profane.

M.

December 15, 1884.

WATER BAPTISM—IS IT OBLIGATORY ON INFANTS OR EVEN ADULTS?

SIR,—As all about baptism is still questioned by Friends (so-called) and others, allow me to make a few remarks.

(1) Baptism is denied to be obligatory, but our Lord's command is plain (Matt. xxviii. 19), "Go, teach all nations, baptising them," &c. This rule was followed by the Apostles—by St. Peter (Acts x. 48), "he commanded them to be baptised"; (Acts ii. 38), "be baptised every one of you"; by St. Paul, the same was done at Philippi (Acts xvi. 33).

(2) Water baptism is denied. What then meant St. Peter (Acts x. 47), "Can any man forbid *water*, that these should not be baptised?" Why did not Philip rebuke the Ethiopian when he said, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptised?" If water-baptism is a delusion Philip encouraged it, for "they went down, both into the *water*, and he baptised him."

(3) Infant baptism is particularly denied. But children must have been included in the household which St. Paul baptised (1 Cor. i. 16); also in the jailor's (Acts xvi. 33).

(4) Why should not infants be taken into God's family now as they were in Jewish times? Especially as our Lord says, "Suffer little children to come unto Me."

(5) It is true they cannot have those graces, which in adults are required. But neither could a Jewish infant have that faith which Abraham had before circumcision; the cases are exactly similar; or else let it be shown that God's favour is now limited to those who can have a previous preparation.

(6) But St. Paul did not baptise with his own hands, and he thanks God that he had not done so. But then he gives his reason, "lest any should say that I baptised in mine own name" (1 Cor. i. 15). Even then men said, "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ." Just as we have now Irvingites, Darbyites and Kellyites, &c. If St. Paul disapproved of baptism, commanded by Christ, he would not have suffered it to be done for him by others.

(7) We find no more injunctions about water baptism. Very true! It was ordered by Christ, and performed by the apostles; there was no need of enforcing what was universally obeyed. No communion, no party in the Church ever neglected it till the Friends arose in the 17th century. Will any one maintain that a rule, universally observed, was of human institution, notwithstanding our Lord's words, and His apostles' compliance, and that all the world was deceived until Friends arose to enlighten it.

(8) But Friends object to war; so do we, unless necessary. So we do to going to law. But even friends will, by law, defend houses and lands and enforce debts and rents. War is no more forbidden than law-suits.

(9) Friends also condemn oaths; so do we, except in Courts of Justice. Our Lord was put to His oath by the high priest, and He submitted to the ordeal (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64). All that our oath means is, "I, in God's presence and with Him before me, say so and so," as if the judge said, in the High Priest's words, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell me whether such and such took place." All that the apostles meant by condemning swearing was the profane use of it, to swear at a proper time in God's name is actually commanded in the Old Testament

and therefore cannot be wrong even if we had not our Lord's own example (Deut. vi. 13; Jer. iv. 2; Is. lxx. 16).

(10) There is not a word above, but what is to be read in even the penny catechisms of Presbyterians, Methodists, and Independents, and even of Romanists. But still we must be ready to give an answer, when even the rudiments of religion are called in question; others' ignorance makes us speak, and cannot excuse our silence.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

THE SLOW PROGRESS OF SANITATION.

SIR,—At a recent meeting of a sanitary association, the Inspector of Nuisances for the Port of London, in a paper read by him, observed, "Seeing that from the Jews sprang the first fruits of sanitary science, we wonder why it was so long in taking root in this country." He then referred to the time of Henry the Eighth, and the continued plagues and sweating sickness which were the direct results of the grossly insanitary conditions generally prevalent in the fifteenth century. The public mind for centuries was not alive to the imperative importance of observing the laws of hygiene. Even in this respect our successive legislators were under the fatal spell of crass custom. It appears strange to relate, but it was not until 1848 that the initiative was taken by the House of Commons, when the Public Health Act was passed. In 1866 a further legislative measure was introduced, another in 1872, and the widest measure of all by the passing of the Public Health Act of 1875. Much more, however, remains to be done, and must be done if the interests of the commonwealth are not to be disregarded.

Indeed, in the matter of burying the dead we are far worse than ever, for until the past few centuries the undertaker's imperishable coffin was not known, nor were the dead committed to the grave after the irreverent and indecorous fashion that obtains now-a-days. Intramural interment was rarely practised in ancient times, nor were mortal remains placed five or six deep, as I learn is no unusual arrangement in civilised England and in the capital of the empire. "Tell it not in Gath!" The old Roman law forbade the placing of the dead among the living, thereby following the Jewish custom. Between the years 381 and 509 this law was again stringently enforced, with the view of preventing contagion. Not only so, but the Roman authorities went so far as to order the removal of such bodies as had been previously buried within the cities. The first Christian cemetery was established in Rome in the year 509. This, unfortunately, was the commencement of the reprehensible practice of burial in churchyards and small enclosed spaces within the inhabited parts of cities, an evil proceeding continued until the eighteenth century, when, as one scientist observes, "the practice had become so monstrous that the Governments of Europe, under the advice of learned men, began to enact laws prohibiting or restricting this mode of sepulture." We read in Plutarch's "Life of Solon" how the Megarians put three or four corpses in one tomb, unlike the Athenians, who had a separate tomb for each, a sanitary arrangement carried out only at the London Necropolis, where each tenant is supplied with a grave.

Our sanitary progress in burial matters is most wretchedly slow. Now and again the Privy Council move a little in the right direction. But their action is spasmodic and intermittent. I find it is intended to close the churchyard of St. Mary's, Fulham. On this topic the advice of the Home Office is to be taken early in January. Eight other churchyards came under the notice of the Privy Council at its last meeting, and probably will also be closed. But on what grounds should the lesser evil be suppressed and the greater evil be suffered to continue? I do not question that the burial-places about to be discontinued as depositories of further dead are justly condemned. But are they as bad, in a sanitary sense, as Brompton or Kensal Green cemeteries, or others which I need not name? Are they as menacing to the public health? Or, have they, unlike the former, been repeatedly denounced by scientific authorities, public journals, and even Government inspectors themselves? Assuredly not. Why, then, is the greater evil to remain untouched, until some sudden outbreak of pestilence will bring official bodies to their senses, and stir up the Home Secretary to action?

Of course the only remedy for the sad state of things we witness, and the only security for the public safety is, the speedy closing of our London polluted cemeteries in which mortality is stowed away to an almost inconceivable extent, and the rendering compulsory earth-to-earth burial at suitable distances from the metropolis. The vast expense consequent upon the preparation of new cemeteries need not be incurred, nor the land taken from tillage, as the extensive and well-planted Woking Cemetery will suffice on Mr. Seymour Haden's showing, for the mortality of greater London during several centuries to come. Our present cemeterial system is radically bad, and only the slow progress that sanitation is making among us accounts for its continuance.

CLERICUS.

Reviews and Notices.

BALAAM: AN EXPOSITION AND A STUDY." By Samuel Cox, D.D. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.) 1884. Pp. 208.

IT is exceedingly difficult to criticise so interesting a book as this. Dr. Cox gives us so vivid a picture of Balaam, and then comments with such force and reality, that criticism becomes impossible. We read, are delighted, and are certainly instructed, and we finish the book in a wholly contented and not at all critical frame of mind. And yet, in truth, the book is an attempt to whitewash Balaam; nevertheless, we come away with no better opinion of that venerable hypocrite who "said and did not." To compare him, as Dr. Cox does, with Saul, or Solomon, or Jacob, or Jonah, may indeed show him to be no worse than they were; but surely, surely, two blacks do not make a white! To be no worse than two of these characters, Solomon—the Pope Leo the Tenth of the Old Testament—or Jacob, who in early life was a rogue pure and simple, is not much praise. To say—"Taking him (Balaam) for all in all, remembering and making due allowance for his age, his blood, his breeding, his temptations, I for one should hesitate to pronounce him a worse man on the whole than Saul, or Solomon, or Jonah. They had advantages denied to him. He had disadvantages—defects of will and taints of blood, a bias of hereditary habit,

a license of custom, force of temptation—unknown to them. If God could use and inspire *them*, why should He not call and inspire *him*?" If God could make large allowance for them and chasten them from their sins, and make their hearts perfect with Him before all was done, why should Balaam be 'cast as rubbish to the void'? Why may not the same just and merciful God have long since clothed him in the righteousness which he loved and desired, chastening him, in this world and in the next, from the taints which marred a character in much so high and noble, and not suffering a soul so capable and precious to perish everlastingly?"—shows indeed a spirit of large charity with which we can heartily sympathise, but we must still avow it is only pleading, not proof. There is no proof that Balaam "loved righteousness" as such. He loved to be on the winning side, and had the insight to see that righteousness was the winning side; but that is quite a different thing to loving righteousness as such. Balaam recognised the power of Israel just as Simon Magus recognised the power of St. Peter, and both would like to have been on *that* side, but the hearts of both loved simply power, and we like Simon Magus the better for making no fine speeches.

"THE MONTHLY INTERPRETER." Edited by Rev. J. S. Exell, M.A. November and December, 1884. (Edinburgh: P. and P. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.)

THE cry is "Still they come!" More and more books *about* the Bible. And if only they lead people to read the Bible—if possible in the original Hebrew and in the original Greek—so much the better. Let us hope the motto Mr. Exell has selected: "Then said the Interpreter, Come in; I will shew thee that which will be profitable to thee," is to be so understood. And certainly the *Interpreter* begins well. The November number has a very interesting paper by Dr. H. R. Reynolds, on "The Omission from the Fourth Gospel of the Temptation of Christ," though we certainly cannot agree with his remark, "The testimony which the Baptist bore to Jesus when he abruptly cried, 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world' (John i. 29), is best interpreted on the supposition that the terrible experiences of the forty days had been privately communicated by the Lord Himself to his kinsman and forerunner;" for we think any such communication very unlikely. At the same time it must be remembered that the answer to the question, How did the Synoptists know the details of the Temptation? presents only a choice of difficulties; but we cannot think that the details could have been communicated to one whose work was over when his testimony as forerunner was over; or that, had they been, John the Baptist could possibly have doubted afterwards whether or not Jesus was the Christ.

In the December number Dr. Gloag's paper on the "Man of Sin" seems to us to contain very little which is not in Alford's *Prolegomena*, nor does it in the least shake our opinion that Professor Jowett has undoubtedly laid down the true lines of interpretation. And we must dissent still more from the criticism of Dr. Edersheim's recently published "Life." It is ten times better than Weiss, who seems to have superseded Geikie, just as Geikie did Farrar, in popular approval.

Dr. Bruce's papers on the "Kingdom of God" are very interesting. But such expressions as the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven, it should be remembered by all writers are metaphorical, and metaphor both leads and misleads.

ON Friday the Northern Convocation was further prorogued till Friday, January 16, but it will not meet for the despatch of business till Tuesday, April 21.

IN view of the West London Mission in February, special services will be held (by kind permission of the Dean) in Westminster Abbey on Monday, January 12, 1885, for members of the Lay-Helpers' Association, and any of their friends who are interested in the Mission. There will be Holy Communion at 7.30 a.m.; and a service of Intercession, with address by the Rev. J. H. Lester, Diocesan Missioner of Lichfield, at 7.30 p.m.

AMONG the deacons ordained by the Bishop of London last Sunday was Mr. F. L. Donaldson, B.A., of Merton College, Oxford. This gentleman was for some years a secularist of Mr. Bradlaugh's school, and was led to accept the Christian faith by the Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, who baptised him in 1877, and under whom he will now work as curate of St. Nicholas Cole-Abbey. It is known that Mr. Shuttleworth has been instrumental in reconciling not a few others to the Church of Christ.

ON Saturday the Bishop of Liverpool admitted fifteen gentlemen to the office of lay-reader in the Bible Porch attached to St. Saviour's Church. His lordship presented to each candidate, kneeling before him, a copy of the New Testament, together with the episcopal letter of recognition and approval, and solemnly admitted him to the office in the name of the Trinity. A short service in the church followed, at which the bishop addressed the lay-readers, taking for his text Philippians iv. 3 (last clause). The whole service was at once simple and impressive.

IT is announced that the Rev. J. Stevenson Lyle has been received into the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Lyle graduated at Dublin University in 1871, and was ordained the following year by the then Bishop of Rochester. Moved by appeals for help from the Bishop of Bombay, he desired to offer himself for India; but it was not till 1876 he obtained the consent of his family, and he was allowed to accompany the Bishop of Colombo to Ceylon. Having means of his own he was appointed to Mission work among the heathen at a new station, maintaining himself at his own cost irrespective of any society. In 1881 he visited England, and was married; but the following year his wife died, and last January he again returned to England. He has this month been received at Rome.

PETERHOUSE, Cambridge, the oldest of the colleges, is this week keeping its sixth-hundredth birthday. It is strange to think that this ancient foundation might have been celebrating a tercentenary in the very year when Emmanuel was founded. There was a commemoration service in the chapel on Monday, when the sermon was preached by the Bishop of Ely, who, although not a Peterhouse man, is certainly a fitting representative of the thirteenth-century prelate who founded the college. If the society has attained a great age, it is no means antiquated; members of the college took an active part in the revived study of philosophy in the

seventeenth century, and in the literary and historical movements of the eighteenth century; while to-day Dr. Routh, the leading mathematical coach, and Professors Thompson and Tait, the chief English authorities on physical science, are all Peterhouse men.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beebe, Rev. Henry T., B.A., Vicar of Yeovil-cum-Preston, and Vicar of Yeovil Marsh.
 Bell, Rev. Walter, Canon of the Cathedral and Collegiate Church, Isle of Cumbrae.
 Bishop, Rev. Francis, Curate of St. Nicholas's, Durham; Vicar of St. Andrew-the-less, Clifton, near Bristol.
 Blackett, Rev. William R., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Nottingham.
 Brabazon, Rev. John, Chaplain to the *Diamond*.
 Child, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Allington, Wilts.
 Cruttwell, Rev. C. T., M.A., Head Master of Malvern College; Rector of St. Nicholas, Sutton, Surrey.
 Dougherty, Rev. John A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Sultan*.
 Edwards, Rev. John Wilkinson Gamul, M.A., formerly Vicar of Knottingley; Vicar of Melchbourne.
 Egan, Rev. Robert, Chaplain to the *Cleopatra*.
 Firmstone, Rev. Charles Henry, Vicar of Wheatley, Oxon.
 Henderson, Rev. John, Vicar of Ashampstead and Chaplain of Bradford Union, Berks.; Vicar of Newbarns-with-Hawcoat, Barrow-in-Furness.
 Hill, Rev. Arthur P., Chaplain to the *Repulse*.
 Lloyd, Rev. John, B.A., Vicar of Llanfihangel Aberbythick; Rector of Pemboyr, Carmarthenshire.
 Lochée, Rev. L. T., Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Graham Street, S.W.
 Lord, Rev. Morton Frewen, B.A., Rector of Leaden Roding.
 Miles, Rev. Charles Oswald, M.A., Curate of Bailey, near Royston, Herts.; Vicar of Shirehampton.
 Nathan, Rev. Thomas, Curate of Disserth; Rector of Katedine, Breconshire.
 Thomas, Rev. William, Vicar of Llanwotyd; Curate of Tirabad (otherwise Llandulas), during vacancy.
 Thompson, Rev. Benjamin Norton, Rector of Wistaston, Cheshire; Vicar of Christ Church, Bath.
 Tomes, Rev. S. H., Curate of Christ Church, Birmingham; Vicar of Naseby.
 Vernon, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Shapwick-cum-Ashcot.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alleyne, Rev. John Forster, thirty years Rector of Kentisbeare, at Kentisbeare Rectory, Devon, on the 16th inst., aged 80.
 Austin, Rev. Edward, M.A., at the Rectory, Rendlesham, Suffolk, on the 17th inst., aged 61.
 Booth, Rev. George Ayscough, M.A., late Vicar of Clandown, at 54, Pulteney-street, Bath, very suddenly, on the 17th inst., aged 67.
 Brockman, Rev. Ralph St. Leger, fifteen years Vicar of Brightwell-cum-Foxhall and Kesgrave, at Brightwell Vicarage, near Ipswich, Suffolk, on the 19th inst.
 Everett, Rev. Charles William, formerly Rector of Woolhampton, Berks., at St. Cuthbert's, Bath, on the 22nd inst.
 Fuller, Right Rev. Thomas Brock, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Niagara, at Bishophurst, Hamilton, Canada, on the 17th inst., aged 74.
 Hill, Rev. George, at Sacombe Rectory, Ware, on the 17th inst.
 Jacob, Philip, Archdeacon and Canon of Winchester, and Rector of Crawley, at the Close, Winchester, on the 20th inst., aged 81.
 Parker, Rev. Wm., having been fifty-eight years Rector of the parish, at Little Comberton Rectory, on the 17th inst., aged 91.
 Turner, Rev. William Twiss, late Rector of Ore, at Maze Hill House, St. Leonards-on-Sea, on the 18th inst., aged 71.
 Travers, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Rector of Englefield, Rural Dean of Bradford, second son of the late Captain Thomas Otter Travers, E.I.C.S., of Leemount County, co. Cork, at Englefield Rectory, Reading, on the 20th inst., aged 63.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 032513886